PROGRAM FOR USDA/USTR LISTENING EVENT

CHAIRMAN: KEVIN KELLY

DATE: Friday, June 4, 1999

TIME: 9:30 a.m.

PLACE: Florida Citrus Building

500 - 3rd Street N.W.

Nora Mayo Hall

Winter Haven, Florida

BEFORE: GAYE MONAGHAN, CVR

Certified Verbatim Reporter

and Notary Public, State

of Florida at Large

APPEARANCES

PANEL:

a.m.

Commissioner Bob Crawford Ambassador Susan Esserman Marc Baas Dr. Isi Siddiqui

p.m. (before break):

Dr. Martha Roberts Teresa Howes Marc Baas Dr. Isi Siddiqui

p.m. (after break):

Dr. Martha Roberts Teresa Howes Marc Baas Pat Sheikh 1

2

INDEX

3

4		Page	е
5	THE HONORABLE BOB CRAWFORD		. 4
)	AMBASSADOR ESSERMAN		
6			-
	KEVIN KELLY		
7			
	CARL LOOP		
8			
	MIKE SPARKS		
9	RON HAMIL		. 58
	MIKE STUART		. 62
10	PETER HARLEE		. 66
	BOB SPENCER		. 70
11			
	CRAIG WHEELING		. 80
1	2 SKIP JONAS		
	JEFF CRAWFORD		
1	B WILBUR GAMBLE		
	LARRY BARTLE		. 98
1	MARY LOU RACJHEAL		102
	ROBERT UNDERBRINK		105
1	5 MILLER COUSE		107
	ARDIS HAMMOCK		109
1			111
	McKinsly Chatman		117
1			119
	JIM GRIFFITH		130
18			134
	BEN KING		135
19			139
	ANTHONY WATSON, JR		142
20			144
	MARTIN STEVENS		148
2			151
	Court Reporter's Certification Page	•	154
2	lb		

CHAIRMAN: If everyone would, let's join in a Pledge of Allegiance to the flag over here. We'll get started with that. I'll lead that.

(Whereupon the pledge was recited.)

CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Be seated. Okay. It is good to see everybody today. We've got a good crowd. I know there will be others arriving but we need to move along. We've got a tight schedule, so we're going to try to stick to that as best we can. It is a great pleasure of mine to introduce our host today, Florida Commissioner of Agriculture, The Honorable Bob Crawford. Would you please give him a hand.

(Applause.)

1|2

MR. CRAWFORD: Thank you very much, Kevin. Let me first thank everybody for taking the time to come here. I see a lot of local people but I see a lot of people who travelled a pretty good distance to get here. We want to thank you very much for taking the time to be with us.

What I'd like to do first is keep my remarks short. Today's purpose is for our good friends from Washington, who have travelled down here, to have a chance to hear from growers and people involved in Florida agriculture and have them have a chance to express their concerns and their thoughts about trade and other issues. So I'll

keep my remarks very short.

1|1

1|2

Let me just first introduce our guests who have come here and then I'll make a couple of short remarks and then introduce Ambassador Esserman first to make some remarks after I've had a chance to say a few words. So, first let me -- today we're very delighted that the United States Trade Office has selected Winter Haven and Florida to be the first stop on a number of stops around the country to hear from people in agriculture about the upcoming trade negotiations that really will be starting at the preliminary talks in Geneva in June and then November, I believe, in Seattle, Washington.

So trade is now going to be back on the front burner of American debate. Obviously, in this state we know that debate is very important. It's important that we have people engaged in those debates that understand our concerns, and I'm delighted to introduce to you today Ambassador Sue Esserman, who was recently confirmed as the Deputy Trade Representative of the United States. Sue received bipartisan support, unanimous support of confirmation, to the United States Senate in this position.

Prior to that she served as the general counsel at the Department of Commerce where I first got to know her

good work when we were engaged in our tomato suit.

Behind the scenes, Sue Esserman was there helping us get to where we needed to get to on the final resolution of the tomato dumping action. The resolution was very positive for our growers.

She moved from there, the general counsel, to the USTR and now, of course, is serving in the ambassador capacity as the Deputy U.S. Trade Representative. I'm also pleased to let you know that she's a Floridian, so she knows a little bit about this state. I'll tell you we couldn't be more pleased than to have Sue with us today. Let's give her a welcome.

(Applause.)

1|2

MR. CRAWFORD: From the United States Department of Agriculture we have Issi Siddiqui, who is the Special Advisor to the Secretary of Agriculture on Trade Matters. We know Issi from way back working the many years that he served in the California Department of Agriculture. He was the Richard Gaskella of California Department of Agriculture. He battled the medfly and all the things in California. It's good to know there's life after battling the medfly.

But Issi has a number of degrees that make him a real expert, particularly on sanitation.

Phytosanitation, as we get into the trade issues are key, so his position to Secretary Glickman is a key part of what, I think, will go into making negotiations successful and making sure that our people understand the impact particularly from the scientific standpoint of what these trade groups are based of. So Issi, we thank you for being there. Let's give Issi a --

(Applause.)

1|1

MR. CRAWFORD: On my far right we have Marc Baas, who is with the State Department and is with us here today. We're very glad to have him. Marc is pretty much a world traveller when we look at his resume -- many years in Africa and served four years in Tokyo as the Deputy Economic Counsellor. His current assignment is the Director of the Office of Agriculture Textile Trade Affairs, Bureau of Economic and Business Affairs since 1998. We are very glad to have Marc with us here this morning. Marc, thank you.

19 (Applause.)

MR. CRAWFORD: Let me just say that there is no issue more important to Florida agriculture than international trade and international trade agreements. We've been through the firestorm of NAFTA and we are still feeling the fallout of that. We're very grateful

for many of the concessions that were made in the NAFTA agreement to help Florida farmers and the work that Sue and other people on her level have done.

1|5

As we approach these upcoming negotiations, I think the feeling that I get around the state, and really most of the country, is that you support international trade; we've got to have international trade. We're on board with that, but we would hope that these trade agreements are not just free trade agreements, that they are fair trade agreements, that they do recognize the differences of countries, that government imposed and societally imposed expenses that our growers face are not necessarily the same in other countries and that presents an imbalance.

So if we have a level playing field we can compete. We can compete with any country in the world. We realize that in the trade agreements that there's going to be winners and losers, but certainly we try to maximize our winners and we try to minimize the losers. But it is my position, and I believe across the land in the United States and Congress as well, that food production is one of those issues that is so important from a national interest standpoint, that this country could not profit from any trade agreement that would give up our ability

to try to be self-sufficient in our food supply. So we would hope that partially perishable agriculture and agriculture in general would never be sacrificed in the name of trying to implement trade agreements in other sectors of the economy. I think across the land that seems to ring very true and certainly here in Florida.

So we've made some progress and we're very grateful for the announcement of the opening of China for citrus. We are hopeful that these other complications are not going to slow that down too much and we keep trade as a separate issue and resolve all those other issues in a separate debate. We're anxious about that and the other countries that we're on the verge of getting into, yet at the same time we're still worried, concerned, that years after the NAFTA agreement, still the first fresh orange has not been delivered to Mexico. So we need help in enforcing these agreements, and certainly I think you will hear more about that today.

The dumping laws we think are very important, and those that are trying to do away with the across the road dumping law, we think that they are one of the last things that is a legitimate tool that protects our domestic production across the board, and hope that we can maintain that. So again, it's great to have these

people here today that mean so much to our future. With that, let me ask the Ambassador if she would please share a few thoughts with us this morning.

(Applause.)

1|5

MS. ESSERMAN: Good morning. I am absolutely delighted to be here. This is the first of our Listening Sessions that the United States Trade Representatives Office and USDA have organized, and I am especially delighted being a Floridian that it is here in Florida. Thank you very much, Commissioner Crawford, for that lovely introduction. I want to actually thank you for hosting this event, for your leadership on Florida agriculture issues and for your interest and activism on the trade issues, particularly on these important issues that we're going to be facing in the next few years.

I am also very delighted that Congresswoman Thurman is here today. She is a very effective advocate for Florida agricultural interests.

This is a Listening Session so I do want to spend most of my time listening to you, but I'd like to just begin with some brief overview on some of the principles that we think are going to be important on why we see that it's very important that we launch a new trade negotiating Round and some of the basic issues that we're

likely to address.

Let me just say that I really do very fully agree with the basic outlines that you just presented,

Commissioner Crawford, and I think you'll see that from some of what I'm going to say.

To begin with, our agricultural trade policies rest on a few basic principles -- opportunity, fairness and respect for science. As you know, America's farmers are the world's most highly competitive and technologically advanced. Because of this, we produce far more than we can ever eat. That means we must seize the opportunity to export to the 96 percent of the human race that lives beyond our borders.

We are, and we will be in the future, increasingly reliant on exports for success. With 20 percent of Florida's agricultural production going overseas at this juncture, this is as true for Florida as it is for the rest of the nation. Foreign markets, which currently absorb 1 point two billion dollars in Florida agricultural exports are already crucial to the incomes to many Florida farm and ranch families. Overall, Florida is among the top 20 agricultural export states and among the top 10 exporters of fruits, peanuts, vegetables and seeds.

Likewise, as Commissioner Crawford has indicated, our agriculture producers, particularly in Florida, depend on strict and impartial enforcement of our trade laws to address dumping, subsidies and surges of imports.

1|5

2|2

Trade policy must be sensitive to the concerns of import-sensitive products including seasonal, perishable produce -- and you very much recognize that.

As the Commissioner indicated, in 1996, in order to address import surges from Mexican tomatoes, we reached an unprecedented agreement -- a tough agreement that was designed to prevent injurious pricing. It is one that has helped to stabilize markets -- the market and prices and an agreement that has prevented the sustained price drops that occurred prior to the agreement.

Another important principle is that exporters and consumers alike require a strong science-based food inspection regime to ensure confidence in the food supply and to make sure that foreign countries are not creating new trade barriers. These are the fundamental goals that this administration has pursued over the past six years.

Now I just want to focus specifically on what our involvement in the WTO has been about. Through the WTO we have created a set of agreements that have lowered barriers and that are designed to ensure that open

markets are open and fair. Our involvement in the WTO represents 50 years of bipartisan American leadership in the creation of the system and has helped to raise incomes, create jobs, and promote American values of fair play and the rule of law worldwide.

1|5

Now, as you know the first time was in 1995 we brought agriculture into the trading system in the last Round of negotiations known as the Uruguay Round negotiations, and we have begun to see results. As a result of those negotiations we cut tariffs and quotas on farm and ranch products worldwide. These included substantial cuts in tariffs in Japan and Korea on oranges and fresh grapefruit.

The European Union reduced tariffs for orange juice from 19 percent to 12 percent, and we won similar concessions from a number of other countries. We also began to cut foreign subsidies. And finally, we won the consensus that health and food safety standards should be based strictly on science and public health, rather than serving as disguised barriers to your products. All of these create new opportunities for us to market our goods.

Another very important element of the last Round of negotiations and the creation of the WTO as an

institution is a dispute settlement system. We need to make sure that the agreements that we negotiate are not just paper agreements -- that we have a mechanism to bring home the benefits of these agreements back to the United States, and we do that. We created the dispute settlement system and we in the United States have been the most active user of the system and overall we've done very well -- I would say far better than we do in American courts.

We have won 20 out of the 22 cases that we have taken to the WTO and won at the WTO all of our agricultural cases. Interestingly, nearly half the cases we've taken to the WTO involve agricultural products.

We've won important victories and victories that will be of enormous significance to Florida interests. You may know of a few celebrated cases such as the bananas case, and of course the beef case which is of much more direct relevance to Florida interests. Here we have threatened to take retaliation if the European Union does not comply with its obligations.

I am going to focus on the WTO but of course, as you know, we pursue our interests not only through the multi-lateral negotiations we pursue but through important bilateral agreements. I just have to mention that

because we have done a number of them that are important to Florida. Most recently, as you all know, we concluded an enormously important agreement with China which will have substantial benefits for Florida.

Our ability to secure this agreement really relates to the WTO. It was because the Chinese government was following the WTO standards that we were able to get this agreement. China agreed in this bilateral agreement.

I'm emphasizing that because this agreement is already now in effect and will remain in effect regardless of what happens with our WTO session negotiations.

But, in this agreement China lifted its ban of citrus products and this will have -- really open up the market in an important way to your industry. Indeed, your industry is estimating that this might lead to a market of 200 million dollars in Europe, the lifting of a ban by itself, and with the reduction of tariffs that could come if China exceeds to the WTO will be significant additional opportunities. Many Floridians deserve a great deal of credit for their work on this agreement. They have been working for many, many years. Of course Commissioner Crawford has been instrumental here, but I would also like to mention the incredible advice and assistance of Bobby McGowan who is here today.

We have really benefited so greatly from his advice and counsel over the years.

1|1

Most importantly, I must say that our work is far from done and I know that you know that because there are many remaining barriers to our access to foreign markets, some of which the Commissioner has mentioned. Let me add a few. There are, of course, tariff and other barriers to our citrus products in many markets — the unscientific meat standards in Europe, very high subsidies, tariff and non-tariff barriers in sugar.

In the testimony that you submitted, we saw many other specific barriers in Chili, Mexico -- I just mentioned -- New Zealand, Argentina. Of course, more remains to be done in China. And of course we see a very disturbing trend in Europe toward a disregard of scientific data in biotechnology. This could present a very significant threat to our biotechnology issue.

The President has called for a new Round of negotiations because he sees that our work is not yet done. We must continue to reduce these significant barriers to our exports in agriculture because, as I've said, we've just begun in the WTO and also more broadly to continue to reduce barriers for our industrial goods and our high-tech goods, as well. Again, Florida has a

great stake in our reducing barriers in these areas, as well.

1|1

We are going to be launching a new Round of negotiations at the end of this year at a Ministerial to be held in Seattle. It is the largest trade event ever held in the United States in which ministers from over 150 countries will be coming. I am delighted to know that Commissioner Crawford, and I hope many of you will be coming. There will be industries from all over the world. It is a very important time for us.

We decided to host this event here and the President made the decision because we thought it would maximize our ability to shape the agenda and we could also showcase the competitiveness of American producers and workers. So we are very delighted to have the event here, but we must work hard to make sure that we are shaping the agenda right. That's why this event is so important to us.

One thing -- because I want to really listen to you,
I am going to spare you on some of the details on how we
see the broader negotiations, but let me say of
significant importance to agriculture is that we see this
Round to be very unlike past negotiating rounds. This is
very important to the President. In fact, he laid down a

marker last year when he went to Geneva to say, "We have a very different economy than we used to have and people are not going to wait 10 years to secure results." I think that's very important for the agriculture community, too. So what we have been pressing around the world with our trading partners is the notion that this Round will be completed within three years. There is very little precedent for doing that, but I think we're in a very different economic era and we must work to make sure that that happens.

1|1

While the negotiations will be broader -- it will involve services and probably industrial tariffs, and that's something that I know the agriculture community generally wants -- the issues themselves are absolutely at the core of the agenda. As Vice-President Gore has said, "Our economy depends on fully productive and competitive agriculture," and the Round is our single biggest opportunity in trade policy to make sure that American agriculture remains the world's standard.

In the months ahead and based on the input that we hear today, we will begin to set a specific agenda. Let me just tell you very broadly what we see the basic issues to be. First, reducing tariffs and other barriers to our products overseas; promoting fair trade by

eliminating foreign export subsidies and reducing tradedistorting domestic supports; ensuring greater

transparency and fairness in state trading; and helping

to guarantee that farmers and ranchers can use safe

modern technologies, in particular biotechnology, without

the fear of trade discrimination. And very importantly

-- and I very much appreciate hearing your interest on

this issue -- ensuring that American producers have the

right to effective remedies against dumping, against

subsidies and against import surges, and we need to be

especially mindful of the case of import-sensitive,

seasonal and perishable industries.

Let me just say very briefly that we are already trying to begin to build basic support for our work ahead. We are working through the Free Trade Agreement of the Americas to have our trading partners in the southern hemisphere to agree to our basic views on agriculture. We've taken important steps along that way.

The President has a new African initiative that we are working with our African trading partners to talk about the importance of agriculture, and many of them share our interests and concerns. We're also working with the European Union, as difficult as that can be, to begin to address some of the difficult biotechnology

issues -- and of course the most significant progress we have made specifically is in our bilateral agreement with China, which benefits Florida citrus and others.

In all of our work we, of course, need direct input from you and that is why this is such an important event, because the best way we're going to set our agenda is to ask for your help and to base our agenda on your advice. We want to hear your priorities, understand firsthand the problems that you see in international trade, and based on that we hope to agree on the major opportunities that we should expect to realize.

With this advice we hope to set a broad trade agenda that will benefit Florida agriculture and the state of Florida as a whole and our Nation. Through these negotiations we believe that we can raise living standards for American farm and ranch families and we can establish greater security against unfair trade practices.

Let me just say how delighted I am to be here, and thank you again, Commissioner Crawford, for your hosting of this event. This is very, very important to us, our very first event in a series of Listening Sessions. I look forward to hearing your specific comments, concerns and suggestions.

At this point let me introduce Dr. Issi Siddiqui who is the Chief Adviser to Trade to Secretary of Agriculture Dan Glickman. Thank you very much.

(Applause.)

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

1|1

12

14

1|5

16

1

19

20

21

22

DR. SIDDIQUI: Thank you, Ambassador Esserman. I also want to thank Commissioner Crawford for hosting this event, and Congresswoman Thurman for being here. I would like to join my colleagues in welcoming you all to this Joint USDA/USTR and Florida Department of Agriculture Listening Session as we prepare for the WTO session.

We are having some problems here. It's not going to work. Is there some other place we can --

MS. CORNELIUS: You're okay.

DR. SIDDIQUI: Is it okay?

MS. CORNELIUS: Yes, sir.

DR. SIDDIQUI: As we begin for the WTO Round in Seattle, we felt that we needed to go around the country -- and this is a very ambitious agenda here with holding 12 Joint USDA/USTR sessions in terms of listening to what the different segments of the agriculture industry around the country are thinking. This will help us to prepare for the next Round.

As you know, the next meeting will be in Seattle at the end of November. This will kick off the negotiating process in 134 nations. We appreciate the time and effort that you had made to attend this session today. As we prepare for the beginning of the new Round of multi-national negotiations it is critical that we hear and understand the issues that should be priorities for us as we go around the country. This will help us in developing the U.S. negotiating status.

I think as a background I need to discuss with you where we have been. This slide -- I apologize for the distortion of it because of the wall -- but this gives you the terms of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade or GATT that was established in 1948. There have been altogether eight multilateral negotiations or Rounds, the last being concluded in 1994. For your information, it took eight years in the making from 1986 to 1994.

The establishment of the World Trading Organization or WTO, and a number of other issues as I go along I will discuss, was a major accomplishment of that last Round, especially in creating a trade disputes resolution process was a major accomplishment of the last Round.

Now we are about to begin the next Round at the end of November. Next, please.

This is exactly what we are trying to do with the

series of Listening Sessions here and around the country. We are seeking your input and help in terms of shaping our trade policies for the new Round under the WTO process as we enter the new millennium. As you are fully aware, while our national economy has been booming, it has been a year of struggle and hardship in many parts of rural America.

We at USDA, from Secretary Glickman on down, recognize the hardship you folks are, especially in parts of the country where agriculture is not as diversified as in Florida, going through because of the low grade prices and commodity prices. At USDA we are marshalling all of our resources in working with Congress in terms of finding ways to help the farmers across the country. We are making sure that emergency economic relief gets to the farmers as soon as possible. The strengthening of the farm safety net is one of the top agendas for the work for Secretary Glickman as well as the Administration, that consolidations and mergers which are sweeping agriculture are subject to proper oversight and scrutiny. We continue to press for opening new markets overseas.

I'd like to, as I begin, to go over what our agenda should be. These are the three priorities I'd like to

discuss in the next few minutes -- the critical role that exports play to the U.S. agriculture. There will be slides following this which will demonstrate this. The role that trade agreements have played in obtaining current levels of exports, and thirdly U.S. goals for WTO negotiations for the coming Round. Next, please.

1|5

As you can see, the U.S. agriculture exports 53.6 billion dollars in 1998. Agriculture exports -- supports nearly 750,000 jobs across the country and crops of nearly one in three acres are exported overseas. Exports account for nearly 25 percent of total cash receipts in agriculture and 96 percent. This is a major factor -- 96 percent of potential customers for U.S. agricultural products do not live here; they live overseas. Next, please.

If you look at the overall trend in terms of agricultural exports play in the general overall economy around the country, you're only talking about 11.3 percent contribution of exports in the general overall economy, but this is not true in the case of agriculture. In agriculture, 26.4 percent of total agriculture is exported. So I think this is a major factor. We are more reliant in terms of overseas markets in terms of exporting products. This is especially true of the

states like Florida where you are exporting a lot of high quality products overseas.

This plan is not really going to the state. As a matter of fact, because of the slump we have had in recent years, couple of years, we expect the export sector to grow even further. Next, please.

1|5

If you look at the exports, they reached a high in terms of 1996 but there is a decline. If you move the slide slightly -- I think it's blocking -- to my left, please. With the slump we are experiencing in 1999 we expect that all the projections by the Economic Research Service, as the economies in Asia improve we expect the export trends to grow.

The key to expanding markets and increasing our access to customs outside the U.S. is through trade agreements which are good for American agriculture. We would not be at the level we are at today had we not negotiated such a good multi-international agreement as the WTO last Round as well as NAFTA.

Trade agreements are -- next slide, please. If you look at the trade contributions some of the commodities play this slide will show you that quantities like almonds, which 71 percent of total production is being exported, some of the problems should be of interest to

you in this room are grapefruit -- 37 percent is exported. In terms of lemons, 48 percent and oranges 46 percent of the total production -- this is based on 1996, the average volume which is exported.

1|5

Now, if you go to the next slide which will also confirm these things in terms of dollar values. This lists all the commodities which are exported, any quantity which is one billion dollars or more. If you look at vegetable oils, fresh vegetables, they are 1.1 billion. Then you have fresh fruit 1.9 billion dollars. Then highest commodity in terms of coarse grain, 5 billion dollars, and soybeans to the tune of 6.1 billion dollars.

In the slides I'm going to show you it emphasizes the importance of export -- commodities which are exporting and how they are contributing to the national economy. We recognize that although we have many benefits for agriculture from recent trade agreements, the playing field is not level yet and we need to do a lot more. U.S. tariffs, on an average, are much lower than those of our major trading partners. When it comes to subsidies, one of the major trading partners, the EU, outspent the U.S. 20 to 1. We must continue to work in terms of making sure that health and safety measures do

not act as a disguised protection for some of the countries and are based on sound science.

1|5

A major part of our strategy to level this playing field will be to be successful and work hard in terms of overcoming those problems we did not resolve in the last Round. The next Round I think is very critical, before we go into the next Round, where we have been -- if I could have the next slide, please.

This is another angle which I would like to emphasize here. The correlation between the farm equity and total export. If you look at the red line which shows the growth of exports from 1962 to 1998, this curve is increasing and so is the farm equity. But at the same time in those years the farm exports declined. We have seen a decline and a slump in farm equity. So I think without a doubt, economists will tell you that our future lies in terms of opening more export markets. This is why the next Round will be most important for us to resolve those issues.

This slide shows some of the growth in exports and imports. And again, the point I am making, is some of the major events which took place in the agreements we have had on Japan beef and citrus. That shows that it added into the economy about 1.1 billion dollars. The

total export growth is the green. While imports have also increased, the exports have all displaced the imports, and this is again continuous different -- at the bottom you see different agreements in terms of time line -- the Uruguay Round, NAFTA, Gluten Feed Agreement, as well as the Korean Beef and U.S./Canada Free Trade Agreement. So all of those major agreements have applied.

1|5

I think another factor there to consider, as we talk about the next Round, is that our exports have done well in those years when, in terms of if you look at the slump scheme when there is appreciating U.S. dollars, in those years where they are depreciating the U.S. dollars we can compete more in terms of using an interline or a steep increase in exports because of the dollar working to our advantage, but it is in those years in terms of the depreciating dollar that you see some of the slumps here.

Overall, I think the Uruguay Round has been fair to us. It has already continued to increase U.S. agriculture exports and higher incomes for U.S. farmers who are taking advantage of the U.S. markets in terms of overseas. But the Uruguay Round was just one start. A major part of our strategy to level the playing field for agriculture is to be successful in the upcoming WTO Round

of negotiations. If I could have the next slide, please.

1|1

1|5

Oh, back up. I'm sorry. I think this is just an explanation of what I was showing in the previous chart. This just captures more in terms of billions of dollars. By the year 2005, if we continue to make the progress, the contribution of Uruguay Round is estimated to be about 5.1 billion dollars. NAFTA overall throughout the country about 2.7 billion. Japan's beef interest, as I said, 1.2 billion. Mexico is in excess of 690 million and Euconn Gluten 670 million. Next.

This gives you a pretty good comparison. I think this is where we are seeing a decline because of the Asian economies. You see a slump in the green line in 1998 and also the good year production crops across the wall. But then you also see the red line is declining, the dual export to EU countries and for a lot of reasons, as Ambassador Esserman mentioned -- there are policies in terms of not basing their decisions on sound science.

But if you look at the exports increase, both NAFTA countries, Canada and Mexico, there has been an increase in these years and the trend is leading in that direction. The same thing is in terms of percentages.

This was in absolute dollars in U.S. export and then the next one to your right is the same information, it's just

converted into percentages and totals.

1|5

If you look at the goals which we are looking at for the future, we have to really look at what the roles have been. The major highlights of the last Round are captured in the slide in terms of increasing market excess throughout the world in terms of reducing export subsidies which are provided by some of these countries, and especially EUs. Domestic subsidies, sanitary and phytosanitary agreements -- Ambassador Esselman mentioned this -- this was a major accomplishment. If I may add one more is the dispute resolution process which has brought success for us in terms of dealing with those countries which are not basing their decisions on sound science. Next slide, please.

This slide will show you the average tariff rates which the WTO -- the role of WTO in terms of reducing the tariffs. Total tariffs WTO around the world at this time are about 50 percent, EU are 20 percent and our tariff rate is the lowest, which is 8 percent. So our goal will be in the future Round, as Ambassador Esserman mentioned, to work in this major area reducing tariffs. Next slide.

This is my favorite slide. It shows the Pacman.

Again, if you look at the total subsidies in terms of global subsidies, EU is the major source of that -- 83.5

percent or 7 million dollars. If you look at the small slide which is here, the United States is 122 million. So they are expanding in terms of total on tariff 80 to 1 ratio in U.S. and EU. Next slide, please.

This is the comparison in terms of just picking a few countries in terms of the domestic subsidies which are provided to agriculture in EU countries in terms of 1996 agriculture values. Marketing, you are talking about EU close to more than 40 billion dollars, Japan about 30 billion and we are talking about 6 million the U.S. domestic subsidies. Next slide, please.

I'd like to summarize -- this slide essentially summarizes our goal in terms of the future Round where we are talking about negotiating substantial tariff reductions, eliminate export subsidies, tighten rules on domestic support, reform state trading enterprises as they can also affect, in terms of these monopolies and distort in terms of supply and demand and set up practices which are not transparent and then can deny us final access to some of the markets, so we'd like to see expanded access and improve limitation tariff quotas, and finally facilitate trade in new technologies like biotechnology. Next slide.

As we prepare for the next Round, I think that what

we really want to emphasize in closing is that those of you who are most affected by the next Round of trade negotiations, and that's most of you in this room, we would like to hear early on in the game in terms of what are your concerns, what are your suggestions as USDA and USTR work together in terms of getting ready for the next Round.

1|5

We need your support and suggestions, including any specific proposals you may have for improving our negotiating strategy. You can make your voices heard on this issue by making your views known to the local farm groups who are present here, elected representatives, board, state and federal, and members of the Executive Branch -- some of the members are here this morning, as well as will be available in terms of you can write to. USDA and USTR, both of them have websites which are listed here, and in the handout sheets you received. You can write to Secretary Glickman or Charlene Barshefsky, who is the representative in terms of your suggestions.

In all of our activities we want to send a clear message to the rest of the world that agriculture is a top priority for the next Round and we remain fully committed to open markets and exercise in terms of free and fair trade, but we need your support and advice to

make trade decisions continue to work and these agreements to continue to work for American farmers and U.S. agribusiness.

I would like to hear more as we go along, and I think this is the purpose of the second half of this program.

In conclusion, I would like to emphasize that U.S. agriculture is already a global economy and we have -- are foreseeing a more globalized role for U.S. agriculture in terms of opening up more markets and increasing our share of international trade.

To establish the best international rule for U.S. agriculture we must stay engaged in these multilateral and bilateral negotiations and trade agreements. Our next major opportunity, of course, is the next coming Round as we get ready for the November Ministerial meetings.

In closing, I would like to thank you all this morning for coming here and for allowing us to make this presentation, and for allowing us to hear your suggestions and adding any suggestions and information that you would like to suggest to us this morning. Thank you.

24 (Applause.)

1|1

MR. CRAWFORD: Kevin, before we get cranked up, Marc wanted to make a comment on this.

1|2

1|5

MR. BAAS: Thank you, Commissioner Crawford. I just want to spend one minute to answer a question that some of you might have -- in fact, a question that was asked of me last night -- why is the State Department here.

What are we doing in this trade Listening Session? The answer is actually very simple and I hope understandable.

We are here because we follow foreign policy, and trade policy is a very important part of our foreign policy. It affects our overall relations with 150 countries that are independent countries around the world. So we are here to hear what you have to say so that we can, in fact, better serve you overseas.

We have embassies in about 150 countries. Our embassies are there to promote U.S. interests, to promote U.S. trade policy among those interests. We are also there, frankly, to find out what the concerns are of foreign countries so that when we are entering into negotiations we will know that if we want to get citrus into Country X as our top priority, we may have to consider what their interest is if they want us to, you know, let widgets into the United States, or whatever the issue is. So that is what we are doing here.

We want to hear from you. Yes, we listen to foreigners, but our first constituency is right out there. Thank you very much.

(Applause.)

1|5

MR. KELLY: My name is Kevin Kelly. I'm Director of Florida for Farm Service Agency of USDA. My job is to moderate this session and to keep it moving. We have leaders, we have them here today that are second to none as far as agriculture. I'd put them up against any in the world. We have a good number of them, as you all can see. We're going to try to stay on schedule. I will report that this panel up here has stayed on schedule. We're going to try to continue that.

I recognize that when you have an allotted amount of time it's very difficult to stay exactly on that. We understand that, but we would hope that you would respect each and every one that gets up here and wants to speak. This morning we've got a schedule that is set up and then this afternoon we will give others the opportunity to present some comments after lunch. We're going to start out with a great friend of agriculture and a great friend of mine, and the best way that I can introduce her is a consistent global supporter of Florida agriculture.

Would you please join me in welcoming and receiving The

Honorable Karen Thurman.

(Applause.)

1|5

MS. THURMAN: I, too, will try to keep this very short. Fortunately I will have an opportunity to talk to these folks at Washington, as well, but I felt like as a representative of Florida that it was important that you understood, as a Congressional delegation, how important we feel agriculture is to this state and certainly as we go into these Rounds.

Ambassador, you know, and to the folks out there that may have not seen your work, I know how many times you have had to appear before the Ways and Means Committee on these particular issues and to answer some very tough questions, and you have been very faithful in making sure that all of our voices are heard. So we are very pleased that you are here. It will bring a perspective, I think for you as we enter into these agreements and before the committee as we're trying to write some of these bills — that you'll have a perspective of Florida agriculture, so we're very pleased that you are here.

Dr. Siddiqui, we are equally as pleased that you are here. This is not the first time that you have travelled to Florida. I am just pleased that finally somebody at

USDA is recognizing that we are a different agricultural community than we are in the western part of the United States, and I did notice who was getting the most exports out there from your slides -- so it is very pleasing that you are here to understand our issues, as well. We appreciate that.

Mr. Baas, I have travelled and had the opportunity to work with the State departments and you are exactly right. You have given us the leadership as far as Americans in these different countries. Certainly, your Department has been the one who has allowed us to set up the meetings with those people in those countries and producers, as well as the knowledge that is presented by the folks over there on these issues both so that we understand what we're dealing with, as well as what to expect or they might expect from us.

Commissioner, you and I are just long-time friends. You've been so good for Florida agriculture and what you have done in the leadership in some very difficult times as we've entered into some of these agreements. This has not been an easy time for Florida agriculture, and your leadership has certainly been appreciated from all corners of Florida agriculture. So we're glad you're still the Commissioner and working hard for everybody.

I do want to start though by saying that I do know that as we go into November, and I hope and I know that the Ways and Means Committee will be there -- Mr. Crane has already talked about making sure that that delegation is going there. But I'd like to start off by saying, you know, that we do appreciate the singular attention that the trade representative and the Secretary of Agriculture afforded Florida agriculture by giving us our own Listening Session.

We hope that today's session is productive in a couple of ways. One, that it establishes a meaningful relationship between Florida agriculture and its consumers and our negotiators, and secondly that it provides you, as our negotiators, with the information you need to increase Florida agriculture's market share both at home and abroad.

For all of the market access that GATT and NAFTA afforded some commodities and industries, many sectors of Florida agriculture suffered what we believe is irreparable harm. The most well-known of these sectors, as you've mentioned, is the Florida tomato industry which grapples constantly with dumping from Mexico. However, the impact on our winter vegetables that Florida grows has been equally devastating. So we look to

opportunities in Seattle. My message will be very simple at this time and this is it. Florida agriculture must get at least as much as it gives.

1|5

The specialty crops which Florida produces require and deserve a non-cookie cutter approach at the WTO. Tariff reduction should be taken not by formula but by requested offer. Exemptions from tariff reductions for highly import-sensitive products should be secured. Additionally, a price-based safeguard mechanism rather than the agricultural safeguard contained in the Uruguay Round must be negotiated in order for perishable import-sensitive crops to survive.

Until Section 201/202 takes seasonal and perishable ag products into account, we believe Florida's industry will remain dangerously vulnerable to dumping economies which enjoy the advantage of lower laborers, child labor, and a broader array of chemical tools for those trading partners who highly subsidize, as also recognized by what slides that were just shown. We do have a lot of other friends out there that are subsidizing their exports or producing their commodities as state enterprises, and we would match but not exceed their efforts to reduce market distortions.

By the end of this month I will also be introducing

two pieces of legislation that we've been working on aimed at addressing a few of the issues you will hear about today. The first will establish a reciprocal country of origin labelling for the fresh fruit and vegetable imports of our trading partners requiring such labelling of U.S. exports. We think that is extremely important.

Secondly, during the briefings you have provided members of the Ways and Means Committee we have frequently discussed the small and not so small SPS barriers to trade. While 10 and 20 million may seem insignificant in comparison to say the cases of steel or hormone treated beef, it is big money to many of our producers and clearly the United States can not afford to take each and every SPS case to the WTO. I intend to introduce a mechanism to allow our government to become effective in addressing bogus SPS barriers to trade and foreign markets.

In closing, this has already been mentioned but I think it needs to be recognized again. We do want to congratulate our negotiators for the market access commitments they recently received from China for citrus. I plan to review closely today presentations so that I too can learn about other legislative tools that could be

brought to bear on behalf of our agriculture community.

Again, we thank you so much for doing this.

Commissioner, we thank you for putting this all together. Thank you very much.

(Applause.)

1|1

MR. KELLY: Thank you. Now we'll have Mr. Carl Loop, President of the Florida Farm Bureau and Vice-President of American Farm Bureau.

MR. LOOP: Ambassador Esselman, Dr. Siddiqui, Mr.

Baas, it's great to have you all in Florida. Good

morning. I am Carl Loop. I am President of Florida Farm

Bureau, also the Vice-President of American Farm Bureau.

Florida Farm Bureau is a statewide general farm

organization that represents farmers in every county of

Florida. Our members produce every commodity grown in

Florida and are vitally concerned with the trade policy

and its impact on them.

We certainly appreciate USTR and USDA for making the effort and taking the time to be here today and hear our industry's thoughts and concerns regarding trade.

First, I'd like to give you a little historical background on agriculture in Florida. We are more than sunshine and beaches and theme parks. Our state has approximately 15 million citizens and an additional 30

plus visitors every year, yet our agricultural economy is second only to tourism as an economic engine for our state.

1|1

1|5

This economic engine covers 240 various commodities with an economic impact of 6 billion dollars at the farm with almost a billion dollars paid to more than 91,000 farm employees. We enjoy an agricultural base of fresh and value added productions. We are proud that Florida ranked 9th in value of agricultural products sold in the 1997 year.

Eight of our counties are in the top 100 agricultural counties nationally, with Palm Beach County being number 11. All 8 of these counties are in the top 100 because of their production of import-sensitive crops, mainly sugar, vegetables and citrus.

It is also interesting to look at government payments to farmers. Florida is not in the top 20 states nor do any farm counties rank in the top 100 counties receiving government payments. This demonstrates that there are significant differences within the agricultural industry and that there is little, if any, opportunity or ability to correct public policy impacts on importsensitive crops through government payments.

For this reason, agriculture needs the opportunity

to negotiate specific treatment for specific problems rather than a one-size-fits-all. Florida agriculture urges that the request offer process be used as part of the upcoming negotiations.

1|5

In the case of Florida producers of fresh fruit and vegetables, there have been self-imposed market development costs for the domestic market. These self-imposed costs have not only developed the domestic market for our producers but have made that market attractive to foreign producers. Our government should fight to keep Florida producers in the domestic market just as surely as we fight to keep our domestic producers in foreign markets that we have developed. A market is a market and our domestic markets should not be sacrificed to gain foreign markets.

As we look at the cost of production and the comparative advantage of producers and production, we ask that the cost of regulation be considered including labor and environment. One estimate has been that a third of a farmer's cost is a result of regulatory programs. In the past, commitments were made but have not been lived up to in either federal or foreign policies or in trade agreements.

We continue to ask that an equitable dispute

resolution process be established for perishable agricultural products. This process should consider seasonality, pricing, cost of production, import surges, with targets or triggers established through historical market access that would automatically begin a U.S. investigation.

Another area that must be addressed is the assumption that the least cost food producer will pass these savings on to consumers. This is a fallacy. The University of Florida just completed a study that showed that consumers paid more for imported fruits and vegetables than for domestic grown. We have watched NAFTA and the ensuing Mexico peso devaluation, the economic collapse in Asia and other financial internal policies impact with many of our trading partners. It appears to our members that there should be safeguards from an internal policy decision shift and distort trade.

Florida truly is a magnet for tourism and trade. We ask that sanitary and phytosanitary standards, SPS, not be sacrificed on the altar of market access. Sound science must be used and this way market access can be assured without the threat of new and invasive pests and the cost of eradication.

Government agencies need more resources focused on

our borders as trade increases. Unfortunately, we continue to see trading partners that gain access to our markets but through false SPS complaints keep our products from their markets.

As we look at a new Round of trade negotiations we ask that all negotiations conclude together and that a set time be established at the conclusion of these negotiations, like the year 2002. A certain time frame will allow the industry to be more involved in keeping the process from dragging out for a long period of time. In an effort to expedite the process, we urge that our tariff schedules agreed to in the last Round be maintained and not subject to new negotiations. We also urge that before any more ratcheting down of tariffs occur, our trading partners shall equalize their tariffs with ours.

We urge the negotiators to work to ensure market access for biotechnology products produced from genetically modified organisms. We must impose discipline on state trading enterprises that distort the flow of trade in world markets.

In summary, trade is a two-way street. We don't need to sacrifice our domestic market to gain access to foreign markets. Our producers need effective, dispute

resolution processes with import-sensitive crops when the regulatory cost is considered. Our producers can be competitive. As we talk about market development there is a need to recognize that the domestic market is one that has been developed by domestic brokers and they need continued access to that market. Our priority goal at the Seattle Round should be to identify a way to enforce compliance with existing agreements before moving to new commitments.

I appreciate the opportunity to be here. We're glad to have you in Florida. Commissioner, we appreciate all of your leadership and help in bringing this to Florida and all the other things you do for Florida agriculture. Thank you.

(Applause.)

MR. KELLY: Thank you, Mr. Loop. We will now continue with Andy LaVigne, Florida Citrus Mutual.

MR. LaVIGNE: Thank you, Kevin. Good morning.

Ambassador Esserman, Dr. Siddiqui, Mr. Baas, Commissioner

Crawford, I'm Andy LaVigne, Executive Vice-President and

CEO of Florida Citrus Mutual, a voluntary cooperative

association with membership consisting of more than

11,500 Florida growers of citrus for processing and fresh consumption.

Mutual represents more than 90 percent of Florida citrus growers and 80 percent of the U.S. growers of citrus for processing into processed citrus products. I am before you today on behalf of the members of the Florida citrus industry, Florida Citrus Mutual, and other associations that extend their appreciation for the opportunity to offer these comments to you today. Those groups are the Gulf Citrus Growers Association, Highlands County Citrus Growers Association, Indian River Citrus League, Peace River Valley Citrus Growers, Florida Citrus Packers, Florida Citrus Processors, and the Florida Department of Citrus.

1|5

We are heartened by the efforts of the U.S. trade representative, the U.S. Department of Agriculture, and the other agencies of the Administration to reach out to the growers, processors and affected members of the growers U.S. industries whose health, and perhaps whose very existence, depends upon the positions taken and agreements reached by the United States in any multilateral or regional trade negotiations.

It is important for the Administration to hear firsthand from the farmers who have their lives invested in the land, many of whom have owned the land for several generations. By coming here to our home to listen to the

concerns of the Florida agriculture industry, you will be better prepared to face the challenges of the next Round of the multilateral negotiations and to understand the challenges we face competing in the world marketplace.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

13

14

1|5

16

1

18

19

20

21

2|2

23

While Mutual applauds the general objectives of the balance and comprehensiveness of the WTO negotiations, we strongly oppose the negotiations of any further tariff reductions on citrus or process-to-citrus product reductions or eliminations. Thus, it is essential that any multilateral or bilateral discussions on tariff reductions be undertaken on a request offer basis rather than formula driven or other comprehensive approach. a word, any trade agreements which further reduce U.S. tariffs on orange juice and/or fresh citrus imported from Brazil beyond the level found in the Uruquay Round will not only contravene assurances made by the U.S. trade representative during the North American Free Trade Agreement negotiations, but will also spell the end of the U.S. industry producing citrus for processing and fresh consumption.

The Brazilian citrus industry is the world's largest by a significant margin. It has made no secret of its need to expand the market share in the world's most lucrative market, that of the United States in order to

provide an outlet for their local planting and overproduction which has been characterized most in the past two decades. In fact, the U.S. International Trade Commission recently determined that revocation of an anti-dumping order on frozen concentrated orange juice from Brazil would be likely to result in material injury to domestic growers, thus voting to leave the anti-dumping order in effect.

1|5

While the U.S. industry has worked with the all the administrations in the past on numerous trade liberalizing measures affecting citrus, the Caribbean Basin Initiative, the U.S./Israel Free Trade Agreement, and even the North American Free Trade Agreement deferenced by the U.S. industry in this instance to the apparent Brazilian priorities will be tantamount to suicide.

The U.S. citrus industry can not support any free trade negotiation which does not provide clear-cut protection for the highly import-sensitive citrus industry. Events in the world citrus markets during the past two decades illustrate the challenges posed to the U.S. growers in the dominant Brazilian citrus industry. While orange production is grown in both the U.S. and in Brazil, the tremendous growth in Sao Paulo has far outpaced that in Florida. Orange productions in Sao

Paulo have grown at an annual average rate of 5 percent since the early 1980s, reaching a record 420 million boxes in the marketing year '97-'98. In that year Brazil produced 53 percent of the world's orange juice. The United States produced 40 percent.

1|5

However, in that same year Brazil consumed only 1 percent of its production locally while exporting 90 percent primarily to the European Union and the United States. The United States, on the other hand, exported only 10 percent of its orange juice production while consuming the rest domestically.

The dominance of the Brazilian orange juice -excuse me -- the dominance of Brazilian orange juice in
the foreign markets has enabled the Brazilian industry to
gain tremendous influence over global orange juice
supplies and prices, world orange juice production and
inventory through 20 percent and 59 percent respectively
between the marketing year '93-'94 and the marketing year
'97-'98. The rapid growth in inventories is indicative
of a severe supply problem which has caused both the
Brazilian and commodity futures prices for frozen
concentrated orange juice to decline dramatically during
the past decade in tandem with the Brazilian expansion.

Commodities futures prices are considered one of the

most accurate indicators of U.S. prices for frozen concentrated orange juice which has and will continue to have a direct impact on the price of U.S. processing oranges. Between the marketing year '88-'89 and marketing year '97-'98 the on-tree price of processing oranges in Florida plummeted in response to falling orange juice prices with grave repercussions to U.S. citrus growers.

1|1

The low on-tree prices have increasingly cut into grower's returns, placing them in an extremely tenuous position. This is especially true for growers in the southwest Florida area that produce mainly early and midseason orange varieties.

Unlike annual crops, a citrus tree has a life of approximately 25 years with grower's investment, depreciation and financial decisions made accordingly. Both the Brazilian and the Florida growers -- for both the Brazilian and the Florida growers the commencement of the citrus production is not a decision which can be reversed or modified easily in response to world supplies and prices.

Brazil has already been found by the United States to have engaged in both sales of less than fair value prices and receipt of available subsidies. An anti-

dumping order remains in effect on frozen concentrated orange juice from Brazil. In response to Petitioner's allegation of sales below cost production during the '97-'98 administrative review of the anti-dumping order of frozen concentrated orange juice from Brazil, the U.S. Department of Commerce recently issued a preliminary dumping margin of 62.5 percent to the four companies covered by the review and for the exporters not previously reviewed.

1|1

In addition, in the recent expedited 5-year sunset review of FCOJ anti-dumping on frozen concentrated orange juice from Brazil, Congress found that dumping would likely continue or recur if the dumping order were revoked. Thus, the anti-dumping order on FCOJ will remain in effect.

The lifeblood of the multi-billion dollar agriculture industry in Florida -- tomatoes, citrus, vegetables -- is found in the equalizing import tariff imposed on products from countries like Brazil which do not incur the environmental, worker safety, water, welfare, tax and other government-related costs which Florida growers must bear. In addition, the Brazilian horticultural industry is not subject to the same child labor laws and other labor standards that exist in the

United States.

1|5

Furthermore, that tariff alone does not account for the unfair advantages enjoyed by some foreign producers who have engaged in dumping or received subsidies in past years that put Florida at a marked disadvantage for many years into the future.

In an ideal free market and world economy, natural advantages would outweigh arguments for tariff protection, but the Florida agricultural sector in general can not close its eyes to the reality that eventual elimination of the tariff on Brazilian citrus would be a death sentence to the U.S. citrus industry and devastating to the economy of Florida.

Aside from the impact of unrestrained free trade in the U.S. citrus industry, the most highly touted benefit of free trade agreements, which is lower prices to consumers, would not be realized in the case of processed citrus products. Increasingly, the price of retail orange juice products has not threatened the declining of wholesale or future prices of FCOJ, which has led to a buildup of Florida stocks.

It is fair to assume that the original demise of Florida industry, should the next Round of the WTO negotiations reduce or eliminate the U.S. citrus tariffs,

is not likely to yield direct benefits to consumers but only cost savings to reprocessors. If anything the Brazilian industry, which is already highly concentrated, given 80 percent of the production is held by four companies, will lose competitive restraint on prices and the U.S. consumer will suffer the consequences.

1|5

In conclusion, Florida Citrus Mutual submits that before any new WTO negotiations commence, sufficient limitations must be incorporated into the authorizing legislation including an agreement to proceed only on a request offer negotiating basis to ensure that citrus and similarly situated agricultural industries are not subjected to any tariff cuts beyond what was committed to under the Uruguay Round.

U.S. citrus growers can not be expected to suffer any tariff cuts benefiting the largest producer in the world when their unique conditions of trade, and indeed their very existence, is completely debt dependent on the maintenance of protective equalizing tariffs. Also, the importance of maintaining a stabilizing anti-dumping order on FCOJ can not be overstated. U.S. citrus growers have worked with the U.S. trade representative in the past trade agreements in exchange for assurances that they would not be forced to concede to any future trade

agreements, particularly those which Brazil is a part of.

The Florida citrus industry has other areas of concern as the Administration moves forward with the WTO negotiations, such as retention of strong science based SPS standards, the impact of government relations on trade equity, and as Mr. Loop just mentioned, pest and disease and eradication is a major concern to this state and the industry. But you will hear these concerns from all counterparts in the Florida agricultural community commenting here today.

However, we feel so strongly about retaining the current tariff on orange juice and/or fresh citrus products from Brazil that we have focused our comments expressed in this area. Florida Citrus Mutual respectfully requests the U.S. WTO negotiators carefully consider and fully acknowledge the seriousness of this issue and the great economic stakes involved to Florida citrus growers, the upstream suppliers, and the entire economy of central and south Florida.

Madam Ambassador, Dr. Siddiqui, Mr. Baas,

Commissioner Crawford, we thank you for providing this
opportunity to allow Florida's agriculture industry to
express its concerns and comments regarding the upcoming

WTO negotiations. As I know you are aware, I am also

joined today by Florida Citrus Mutual's trade consultant
Bobby McCallum, who has been intimately involved in these
issues for many years. Should some questions arise I can
always defer to him -- pass the buck. I'll be pleased to
respond to any questions that you have. Again, thank you
for allowing Florida to be the host of the first session
-- the first Round of the Listening Sessions. Thank you.
(Applause.)

MR. KELLY: Mr. Mike Sparks from the Florida Department of Citrus.

MR. SPARKS: Good morning. My name is Mike Sparks and I'm the Deputy Executive Director of the Florida Department of Citrus. We're headquartered in Lakeland. Our Board of Directors is the Florida Citrus Commission. We're a state agency. Our job primarily is to market Florida citrus, and work for the welfare of the Florida citrus grower. We do some research and some regulatory activities, but 85 percent of our dollars spent every year is to develop the marketing programs for the Florida citrus growers.

Our advertising efforts are domestically as well as internationally, and of course our international programs, as well as international trade, are of serious concern to our activities and our programs. Certainly,

the last 20 years our international trade has been increasingly important not only to the marketing programs to the citrus industry -- it coincides with the increased size of our crops. Certainly in the '80s and the '90s the citrus industry has recovered from some devastating freezes, and now nearly 900,000 acres in the state of Florida are dedicated to citrus. With current agricultural techniques, with the replanting, we expect to have bumper crops, record-setting crops, now and in the immediate future.

1|5

In total, our activity in the citrus to the state of Florida, our total economic activity, approximates 8 billion dollars and the citrus industry employs over 100,000 Floridians.

The Department of Citrus and the citrus industry has developed some extremely important partnerships with the United States Department of Agriculture and USTR as they try to foster the development of new, lucrative export markets. Our activity with USDA and the MAP program helps us further advance our marketing programs of which we have welcomed the opportunity to work together. And certainly new markets such as China are very -- we're very optimistic in some of the areas there to help increase our exports.

But as important as those international markets are, we just simply can not ignore, simply can not recommend, trading away the existing tariffs on FCOJ. Let's talk — let me share with you in just a second a supplement to Mr. Andy LaVigne's thoughts on the cost of Brazilian and Florida product, as well as some of the investments that the citrus grower has already made.

1|5

Our research, and it is supported by the University of Florida, shows currently not unlike the past data that the cost to grow -- the growing cost in Brazil approximate 48 cents per pound solid. That includes pick and haul, capital cost and the citrocultural costs.

Compared to Florida, 76 cents or nearly 30 cents greater per pound solids to grow and produce our Florida citrus.

The significant difference in the cost between our growers and Brazilian growers is certainly the higher environmental and labor costs faced by our growers in the state of Florida. In fact, this year alone labor was difficult and when we could get labor to harvest our crops we estimate that it was an additional 54 million dollars this year alone to harvest this year's crop.

To compact the difference, Florida relies on the quality of our products as well as our domestic tariff established on FCOJ to keep our growers in business. Any

reductions to the current FCOJ tariff would have the world's single largest market, the United States, be flooded by competition from above. If you look at the U.S. market, currently the average per capita consumption in the United States of orange juice is nearly 6 gallons per every man, woman and child. If you look at other countries around the world, United Kingdom half of that, 3 gallons. It drops down of course, Japan, Spain, not quite 1 gallon per year.

There are two reasons there's a marketable difference in per capita consumption in the United States as compared to other countries. Certainly, the economic power of the American consumer, but second, the investment of the Florida citrus grower. Our citrus forefathers and our current Commissioner continues to provide commodity advertising to support Florida orange juice and Florida fresh citrus.

If you look at the increase in consumption decade by decade, we believe our advertising programs, as well as the brand advertising programs, help increase the consumption of Florida OJ.

Florida growers have invested in the past -- since
1935 since the Florida Department of Citrus was
incorporated, Florida citrus growers have invested 1.2

billion dollars in marketing programs only to grow the U.S. market. They deserve a great deal of credit for having the focus to make such a dramatic investment, yet the 1.2 billion dollars that the growers have paid since 1935 is only a small part of the industry's overall investment.

1|5

Investments in processing plants, fresh fruit packing houses, infrastructures, brand advertising, all support our current total economic industry of 8 billion dollars. All were developed with the understanding that there was the federally mandated tariff on FCOJ. That gave us the assurance to develop not only the U.S. market, but of course fair international trade.

We have a paper that we would like to leave behind. But certainly, as a closing statement it is the belief of the Department of Citrus and the Florida Citrus

Commission that our growers deserve fair consideration of our Federal Government that any future trade negotiations be limited -- no tariff reductions and the limitations not go beyond those already committed in the European trade events.

Certainly, on behalf of the Florida Department of
Citrus and the Citrus Commission I want to thank you for
your attendance and certainly for the opportunity to

share some of the concerns that we have. (Applause.)

MR. KELLY: Next we have Mr. Ron Hamil. Then Mike Stuart after Ron Hamil.

MR. HAMIL: Thank you. For the record, my name is Ron Hamil and I'm Executive Vice-President of the Gulf Citrus Growers Association. As you heard Andy LaVigne mention, we are in southwest Florida and we are probably amongst the most vulnerable to any changes that could be made regarding the trade policy and further reduction of the tariff.

I represent about 180 citrus growers and about 150,000 acres of citrus there in southwest Florida. On behalf of those growers, we certainly echo our colleagues and commend Mr. Crawford for hosting this session and appreciate you all from the US Trade Office, Ambassador Esserman and Issi Siddiqui for being here, and also the representative from the State Department.

Growers in southwest Florida represent Florida's southernmost citrus. We produce about 22 percent of the current crop here in Florida. We're a 5-county region and we account for about a billion dollar economic impact to southwest Florida. Hendry County, which is kind of the heart of our citrus industry in the southwest, has

more citrus and more orange trees than any other county in the state of Florida.

1|5

As I think Mr. Sparks mentioned, the industry is recovering from freezes, and much of that movement has occurred in southwest Florida. Many of the growers have moved south and joined some of the area's pioneers and planted new citrus groves. These new plants obviously take a lot of capital to put in. I will say that our members employ the latest technology, including advanced water conservative low volume irrigation and on-site retention areas to produce citrus. In addition, our groves are managed using the most progressive, state-of-the-art cultivating practices and in accordance with the volumes and realms of rules and regulations required by our county, state and federal laws.

Between 85 and 88 percent of our crop are processed oranges that go into juice and compete head-to-head with Brazil, Mexico and other citrus-producing countries.

They are competing and vying in the U.S. market, a market which we feel Florida growers helped to create, and as Mr. Sparks said, have invested billions of dollars of their own money in building.

While our primary market here is in the U.S. with its high consumption of orange juice, due to these

investments our competitors, including the world's largest citrus juice producer, Brazil, primarily grows for export and for export into the U.S. They are attempting again to negotiate reduced tariffs. I can say unequivocally that any reduction in that tariff would have a devastating impact on our industry here in southwest Florida.

While Gulf Citrus supports the concept of fair trade, we feel that any further tariff reduction on citrus and citrus products particularly from Brazil beyond those already negotiated would be totally unfair to our growers.

I'd like to ask a question of what is fair. Is it fair that our Florida citrus growers are required to meet increasingly stringent local, state and federal rules and regulations related to water and the environment and our world competitors are not? Is it fair that our citrus growers are faced with state and federal laws related to wages, health care and welfare for its farm workers and our competitors, including the world's biggest orange producer, Brazil, are not? And is it fair that although in previously negotiated trade agreements that the U.S. has opened its markets and doors to foreign produce and citrus, and to our knowledge not the first shipment of

Florida citrus has been allowed in a country such as Mexico?

1|1

In our grower's mind the answer to these questions on international trade do not translate to fair trade to our growers. We feel U.S. trade policies should not continue to adversely affect domestic producers who face ever-increasing volumes of regulations as well as global competition.

We feel that although the current import tariff on products from countries which do not incur the same environmental, water, welfare and tax vouchers as Florida growers does not totally come from the increased costs of producing our citrus over our competitors from offshore, it does serve as somewhat an equalizing factor and it must be maintained in its present form.

Any further reductions beyond those made in the Uruguay Round would certainly spell disaster for citrus growers in the Gulf region. Devastation to our industry in southwest Florida would certainly have tremendous economic disaster on our local world communities -- our people, our other allied industries.

So again, on behalf of Gulf Citrus, we sincerely appreciate you all beginning these first Rounds here in Florida. This is a big step forward. Commissioner, we

commend you on that and we certainly do appreciate you all being here and look forward to working with you on this next Round. Thank you.

(Applause.)

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

1|1

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MR. KELLY: Mike Stuart followed by Mr. Pete Harllee.

MR. STUART: Good morning. My name is Mike Stuart. I'm the President of Florida Fruit and Vegetable Organization. We're an organization that represents growers and shippers of fresh vegetables, citrus, tropical fruit, sugarcane and a whole variety of other products here in the state. We, too, would like to extend our thanks and appreciation to all of you for coming here today and spending time with Florida I think it hopefully will be time well agriculture. I particularly want to thank Commissioner spent. Crawford and his staff for all the hard work that I know went into putting this whole event together. you very much.

I'm going to try to keep my words relatively short here this morning. Hopefully we'll have an opportunity here shortly to here from producers, processors, marketers, suppliers and others whose livelihoods are at stake currently with the future of Florida agriculture.

We hope you'll take those comments into consideration, listen to them closely and particularly as we move towards the new Round of talks at the WTO.

1|5

To put it simply, our growers are wary of trade agreements with countries whose producers enjoy a competitive advantage in the marketplace, not necessarily because they have better technology or have better marketing practices. They don't. They enjoy that competitive advantage because they have a distinct advantage in terms of less restrictive regulatory and legislative environments.

In our experience, I think since the implementation of the Uruguay Round and particularly the North American Free Trade Agreement, would suggest that those fears were well-founded.

As we move towards another Round of the WTO multilateral trade negotiations, as well as the Free Trade Area of the Americas initiative, growers are understandably concerned. They are concerned that the results of these initiatives will be the further erosion of market share here in our own domestic marketplace.

We are also concerned that there will be a continued lack of progress in opening up export markets. The bottom line is, we are concerned about losing domestic

market share faster than we're losing our ability to develop export markets.

1|1

If these trends are not reversed, the future of Florida agriculture is very much in doubt. During the negotiations leading up to both the Uruguay Round and the NAFTA, the fruit and vegetable industry was assured that provisions would be in place to protect the industry. Yet, despite those assurances and commitments, the industry has suffered.

Many of the safeguard measures, in particular, have failed to function as envisioned. Before we launch into another Round of WTO talks, the United States should address and correct the failures of the previous agreements. Once that is accomplished, we then should press for WTO reforms that adequately address the concerns of both import-sensitive and export-oriented U.S. agricultural sectors.

Moving forward we recommend the following. Many of these things will be echoed in more detail, I am sure, by other speakers here today. We've provided greater detail in the written comments that we've submitted for the record.

In the area of tariff reductions, FFDA supports a requested offer approach, not the formula approach used

in the Uruguay Round negotiations. We also urge that tariffs for the most highly sensitive U.S. agricultural products such as Florida winter vegetables and citrus not be reduced below the levels agreed to in the Uruguay Round.

1|5

Safeguard provisions are needed for import-sensitive fruit and vegetable products. The changes here also need to be made in the U.S. trade laws so that the unique nature of its perishable and seasonable production in the U.S. is taken into account.

A mechanism is needed to cushion the effects of currency devaluation on market access concessions. Given the recent economic crises in both Asia and Latin America, currency devaluation and its effects on trade simply can not be ignored.

Finally, we must insist that science be the driving force in the debate over sanitary and phytosanitary measures. At the same time, the U.S. must ensure that there are sound scientific concerns about the potential risk of the introduction of plant, animal, pest and diseases. Sufficient resources must be allocated to protect American agriculture.

As we move forward, it is important that we all remember that trade is about more than just tariffs.

There's a high price for the quality of life and standard of living we have here in our country. In competing in the global marketplace our growers are paying that price and in many cases our competitors are not.

We look forward to working closely with all of you as this process unfolds. Using the trade vernacular at the end of the day, we want to be able to say that Florida agriculture is a winner in the Seattle Round, not a casualty, but we're going to need your help to make that a reality. Thank you very much.

(Applause.)

1|5

MR. KELLY: Now we've got Pete Harllee followed by Bob Spencer.

MR. HARLLEE: Good morning. I'm Peter Harllee,
Junior. My company, Harllee Packing, is based in
Palmetto and grows, packs and ships tomatoes. My family
has been growing tomatoes in Manatee County in excess of
100 years and presently we have a fifth generation of the
family working on the farm.

I am Chairman of the Florida Tomato Committee, an organization that markets Florida tomatoes under a federal marketing order. I also serve as Chairman of the Florida Fruit and Vegetable Association, a trade association representing growers of fresh vegetables,

citrus, sugarcane and other products. These organizations help Florida producers grow and market crops all over the world.

1|1

1|5

Because of Florida's unique geographic location, our growers can provide consumers here in the U.S. and in other countries with fresh fruits and vegetables that are sometimes not available from other growing regions.

Historically, competition for Florida growers has come from low-cost, often subsidized, production from Mexico and other Latin American nations and Europe.

As we have stated in prior comments to Congress and the Administration, the Uruguay Round Agreement and the North American Free Trade Agreement have led to losses in the market share in the U.S. for Florida growers. At the same time, these trade accords have yielded few offsetting gains in export markets. We fear that the next Round of agricultural talks could lead to more of the same -- more competition for the growers in developing countries who don't face the same high cost of complying with the strict labor, environmental and health regulations that we have in our country and also enjoy lower input costs.

At the outset before the new negotiations begin we ask the Administration to correct the deficiencies of the

prior agreements. When new talks begin, Florida growers ask our trade representatives to seek improvement in future forums. First we ask that the future trade agreements include exemptions from trade restrictions -- trade reductions on import-sensitive crops grown in Florida. Additionally, we ask for safeguard provisions that respond quickly to market swings and are triggered by price and not volume.

1|1

Further, we urge you to seek a way to counter the disastrous effects of currency devaluation which we have seen in Mexico and can significantly alter the intended effect of trade agreements.

In the past five years since the enactment of NAFTA and the dramatic increase in imports from Latin America, Florida has seen a proportionate increase in the number of infestations from damaging pests and disease. The most notorious of these has been our state's battle with the Mediterranean fruit fly. The medfly threatens dozens of citrus and vegetable products in Florida and cost taxpayers and our industry millions of dollars to eradicate.

Another threat is citrus canker, an infection so serious that Florida agriculture officials are devoting hundreds of field staff and tens of millions of dollars

each year in attempts to keep it in check. That battle has just begun.

These pests and disease are introduced into our growing regions by imports and smuggling. A single piece of fruit or even a leaf can lead to disaster. When travelling to visit farms in Australia and New Zealand last year I was impressed by the strict rules officials there enforced to protect their local farms. I was thoroughly searched at every point of entry to the point of having my shoes examined. Penalties for violations were serious.

In contrast, when returning to this country after having spent days walking around foreign farms, I passed through customs easily with no review. I had taken precautions to prevent transporting any host material but I could have been carrying a pest or disease that would have threatened Florida agriculture.

Future trade agreements must work to stop these threats at our border and ports. There is no alternative if we expect to continue growing crops here in Florida.

Today we'll hear from other growers who will share their views about the many issues, some of which I've mentioned here, as well as other concerns. While we may disagree about which issue is important, we do have one

common message. We will gladly compete and grow the highest quality fruits and vegetables available anywhere, but we can not survive unless our trade agreements ensure fairness by opening access to new markets and recognizing the important sensitivity nature of fresh fruits and vegetables.

Thank you for your time. I appreciate the opportunity to present this to you. Thank you. (Applause.)

1|1

MR. KELLY: Now we'll have Mr. Bob Spencer followed by Rick Roth.

MR. SPENCER: Good morning. My name is Bob Spencer. My company, West Coast Tomato, is a grower and shipper of fresh tomatoes to the fresh market located in Palmetto, Florida. Our company has farms, packing houses and sales offices in Florida and California.

Our organization faces a number of challenges to stay in business. Winter freezes have destroyed our crops. Farm labor is increasingly scarce. The regulatory costs of doing business continue to climb. Our access to many of our crop tools to fight diseases and pests is not assured in the future. But by far the most threatening challenge of all is an unstable and unfair trade environment.

In the three years following the enactment of the North American Free Trade Agreement, Florida's production of fresh tomatoes dropped 27 percent. Cash receipts during the same period fell by 40 percent, due in great degree to the depressed prices caused by a flood of Mexican tomatoes on the U.S. market.

1|5

Without a doubt, Florida's tomato industry has been hit by dramatic trade surges from Mexico. In the early 1900s -- or about 1990s, excuse me -- there were about 200 farms that belonged to the Florida Tomato Committee which markets Florida tomatoes under our federal marketing order. Since then more than 100 farmers have gone out of business or sold out to larger farms. More than 20 packing houses have closed in that time.

Many people might blame NAFTA for this unfair competitive agreement, but NAFTA by itself could not have sparked the unprecedented escalation of tomato shipments from Mexico. After NAFTA was passed by Congress, Mexican government devalued the peso sharply over a short period of time, in fact, encouraging Mexican tomato farmers to ship their products to the United States in exchange for the strong dollar.

NAFTA's tariff reduction formulas made no account for this drastic currency shift. Additionally, the so-

called snapback tariffs of NAFTA designed to address surges of product coming from Mexico in the U.S. market lagged way behind actual shipment volume trends. These snapback tariffs only took effect weeks or months after the economic damage was done. It was as if your house caught on fire and the fire truck arrived two weeks later.

Time and again I had customers who could not afford to purchase loads of tomatoes from my operation because they were receiving loads of Mexican tomatoes with no set price which they could sell at a guaranteed profit.

I encourage U.S. trade authorities to seek workable, price-based safeguard protection in future WTO agricultural trade negotiations. The protections afforded the Uruguay Round do not cover Florida's most import-sensitive fruits and vegetables. If some safeguards are to work, they must be triggered immediately in response to import surges without lengthy cumbersome proof of injury provisions. Such requirements force delays in triggering the safeguard mechanisms and compounds injury to our growers. The increased imports since NAFTA have had another eeffect, as well -- increased outbreaks of harmful pests.

Our officials now are fighting the outbreak of

citrus canker in south Florida that has already forced the destruction of hundreds of thousands of citrus trees.

1|5

In Tampa, officials are currently dealing with an infestation of oriental fruit flies. These outbreaks are caused by the importation or smuggling of host materials. Earlier this year, USDA inspectors found fruit fly larvae in avocadoes shipped to the U.S. from Mexico.

While other nations use sanitary and phytosanitary provisions to block or delay our access to their markets, our country continues to import huge volumes of fresh fruit and vegetables. Can we be certain that these shipments do not threaten our domestic farms? Do you actually believe that our trade partners will quarantine their crops when harmful pests or diseases are found?

When negotiating these trade protocols we must be mindful of our nation's port and border inspection teams. They can only inspect a small fraction of the fresh produce coming into this country. We can not rely on them to always intercept infested shipments.

As farmers and growers face competition from other producing nations, we must forge a straight course that number one, will allow fair access for our own exports. Number two, protect our farms from foreign diseases and pests. And number three, incorporate mechanisms for

dealing with the currency fluctuations around the globe.

I respectfully urge U.S. trade negotiators to consider these recommendations as we enter the next Round of WTO trade talks. Thank you.

(Applause.)

MR. KELLY: Okay. Mr. Rick Roth followed by Craig Wheeling.

MR. ROTH: Good morning. My name is Ricky Roth.

I'm President and owner of Roth Farms, Incorporated. I

am a third generation farmer in Belle Glade, Florida.

That's a community just south of Lake Okeechobee in

western Palm Beach, County. I grow a wide variety of

crops including sugarcane, vegetables, rice, sweet corn,

radishes and soy. I am a board member of the Florida

Fruit and Vegetable Association and I'm also a board

member of the Florida Farm Bureau Federation.

I belong to these industry organizations because agriculture is the backbone of our domestic economy and I am committed to preserving the strong agricultural industry and a safe, secure and abundant supply of domestic food for my family, for my community, and for this country. That is why I came to speak to you today and I really appreciate the opportunity to do so.

Now, much has changed since my father and

grandfather moved their farming operation to Belle Glade in 1949. Florida growers today face many more restrictions on land use, water use, farm labor, pesticides and other crop inputs. Now, while these added state and federal regulations had hoped to safeguard our environment and our food supply, they have come at significant cost.

These costs directly affect my ability to compete with growers in other nations which are not required to meet U.S. regulations. Growers in developing nations generally have a much lower overhead cost than I do.

Their relaxed regulatory environment lets them spend far less managing their labor, their water, their land, their farm sanitation and other areas that fall under regulatory jurisdiction here in the United States.

Now, these reduced regulatory compliance costs provide a significant cost advantage for foreign producers. In just the past year, USDA and UDA -- or excuse me, FDA -- announced guidelines for our nation's producers designed to minimize the chances of microbiological contamination. These guidelines were developed at the direction of President Clinton and he announced the initiative to address concerns about foodborne diseases associated with foreign produce.

Now it sounded like a good idea at the time, but when it came time for the federal authorities to put this plan into action they realized they had no effective way to monitor how foreign growers operate. What's more, there is currently no way to adequately screen foreign fruits and vegetables as they enter the United States. The high volume of shipments from foreign producers obviously permit only spot-checks for contaminations.

1|5

So ironically, a food safety program that was largely designed to reduce illnesses associated with contaminated foreign produce can only be implemented here in the United States. The result was a program that cost domestic producers more and does nothing to improve the quality and wholesomeness of foreign fruits and vegetables.

Now, I think we all as farmers agree that we must explore these new trade agreements and new relationships with trading partners, but we think we should approach this in a way that ensures fairness for domestic producers. Our products are seasonal, they are highly perishable and they are very sensitive to price fluctuations caused by supply surges from foreign producers.

For example, this past Christmas the market price

for a crate of sweet corn was only three dollars. You need to know that it costs more than three dollars or right at three dollars to harvest sweet corn. I believe the low market price was attributable, in part, to increasing supply of sweet corn from foreign producers.

1|5

Import surges have hurt Florida growers, as you've heard. Mexico's currency devaluations have encouraged growers to target Florida markets or U.S. markets forcing crop prices down below harvesting costs in this country.

Protections granted under the U.S. trade are largely ineffective because they work too slowly to help producers who must market their crops in very short windows. By the time these safeguard measures are employed, crops are sold at a loss or left to rot in the fields.

I would say that there are some people, many of them well-educated, many of them economists, who would say that our nation's farmers need to shift their production to produce those crops that are not susceptible to these import surges. That kind of strategy might work well if you were in manufacturing, but not in the production of agriculture and especially not in Florida's unique climate. For 50 years my family has been able to operate profitably because of the rich and highly productive

organic soils and because of the access to managed water supply.

But most importantly, we succeed because of the experienced people that work for me, that work with me, from the industry that provide new varieties and new technologies. These people help me grow my crop and bring it to market. This is not a simple situation. This is a very complex economic arrangement and we can not shift crops easily every few years to cope with the dynamics of the changing international market.

1|1

So the question is why must these trade accords be implemented so quickly? Why must we promote free trade at the expense of fair trade and in the end jeopardize the future of Florida's producers? We can all prosper from a fair and less restrictive fair environment.

Everybody agrees with that. But I urge our nation's trade negotiators to demand fairness and equity in these new trade agreements.

I believe our trade representatives should seek a less restricted production and marketing environment but also ensure a safe and abundant domestic food supply. Further, I ask that you enact any agreement slowly with provisions for corrective action from time to time.

In conclusion, I respectfully ask that you consider

the following issues in future trade agreements. First, we must work to establish parity in production standards especially regarding pesticide use and other agricultural practices designed to improve food quality and protect the environment. Otherwise, we will continue to improve our own production practices and increase our domestic cost of production so much that American growers will not be able to compete in the world marketplace. Then much of the produce that we produce -- much of the fresh produce available, excuse me, to U.S. consumers will be foreign grown without U.S. oversight and therefore negating the benefits of the food safety guidelines in the first place.

1|5

2|2

Additionally, I would urge you to seek trade mechanisms that allow quick and responsive remedies to import surges. Section 201 of the Trade Act of 1974 has already been shown to be ineffective in this regard. The Congress has ignored to fix this legislative loophole. So it only makes sense to build such safeguards into future trade agreements from the start.

I would like to thank you for allowing me to speak to you today on an issue that I think is perhaps the single most important issue facing this country today, and that is the continued production of a secure and safe

domestic food supply. Thank you. (Applause.)

(------

1|5

MR. KELLY: I would like to remind you that we are a little behind schedule. I know everybody has got a lot to say, so if you can summarize your comments as much as possible. We have 11 people left between now and lunch. Now Craig Wheeling, please, followed by Skip Jonas.

MR. WHEELING: Good morning. My name is Craig
Wheeling and I'm the CEO of Brooks Tropicals. We're the
largest domestic producer of tropical fruits. Our
company grows tropical fruit like avocados, limes,
papayas and mangos. Our main problem is harmful pest
introduction. It has been mentioned a couple of times
previously, but I just want to go into that in a little
more detail.

In terms of trade, you can't export what you can not grow because you don't have a spray for a hitchhiking pest. All of the fruit we grow is vulnerable to pest introductions like fruit fly. Furthermore, effective sprays either may not exist or may not be approved for use by APA. A good example is bacterial citrus canker for which there is no spray cure or seed weevil where the cure is to burn your tree.

Our firm supports improved trade. Indeed, we are

somewhat unique in that a good portion of our company's business revolves around marketing fruit from Latin America and the Caribbean. But Florida is currently suffering a rash of domestic infestations. In the 1990s we've had two infestations of citrus canker, one of which as has been mentioned before will cost over 170 million to eradicate. Canker is currently one mile north of our commercial lime growing area. In the next month we will spend \$300,000 on chlorine and other wash systems to combat this with no commensurate revenue.

1|1

1|5

Oriental fruit fly found in May 1999. Mediterranean fruit fly, a very bad insect, found in 1990, found in May 1997, found in April 1998. Citrus leaf mite found in May 1993 -- a horrible problem when we tried to replant limes after Hurricane Andrew. Brown citrus aphid found November 1995. Citrus psyllid found June 1998. Citrus longhorn beetle found April 1999. Killer bee found in Jacksonville, May 1999. Mexican weevil, a serious pest, got established in the 1990s. Tomato yellow leaf curl virus found 1997. Asian wooly hackberry aphid found 1998. Small hive beetle, May, 1998. Asian elm aphid 1998. I'll stop, but there are more.

Some of these are very bad pests like medfly and canker which can destroy whole industries. This list

does not add confidence to me or our growers that our borders are being adequately protected. Where are these pests coming from? At the same time of the pest introductions in Florida, trade and travel have increased. From the USDA website it says that the sheer volume of trade means about 70 percent of the trucks sail through the Nogales, Mexico entry gates without anyone from any agency inspecting any cargo at all.

1|5

The systems approach has been used to justify and liberalize fruit importation rules into the U.S. This is a statistical predictive model known as quantitative risk assessment. But we believe that there are problems with the use of this model. Indeed, Dr. Jan Nyrop from Cornell University analyzed the risk assessment model used in the Mexican avocado entry and he concluded that the Monte Carlo simulation was not needed and only provided analytical objectivity, the data upon which parameters of the model were estimated either were non-existent or not adequately documented.

Mexico has been allowed to ship avocadoes into 19 northern U.S. states for two seasons using the systems approach. Prior to this allowance a major area of concern of the model was that it would be impossible to restrict distribution of the fruit to these 19 states.

In the first season USDA agents at Wal-Mart violated the Planned Protection Act by receiving Mexican fruit outside of the designated 19 states. Six states outside of the legal area are believed to have received illegal fruit during the first season. In the second season five other distributors shipped Mexican fruit outside the 19-state area, one shipment of which went to Florida where a scaled insect which found, which in Florida is an actionable pest.

1|2

1|5

Using a systems approach based on inaccurate inputs is equivalent to designing computer software under the old adage garbage in, garbage out. A further problem in trade negotiation is pesticide regulation. Currently we do not have a level playing field. A specific instance, Mexico is allowed to export avocadoes to the U.S. with parathion residue. Parathion is a very bad pesticide. It's acutely toxic and it may pose chronic effects including nerve and muscular degeneration, depression, memory loss and disorientation. It is associated with bird kills since the 1950s and 52 accidental fatalities in the U.S. from 1965 to 1980. Most domestic uses of parathion were cancelled in 1991, however, Mexico is allowed to export avocadoes to the U.S. with a residue of parathion on the fruit.

In summary, as trade has exploded, pest infestations have become a huge problem, especially to subtropical farmers. U.S. producers are severely restricted on what pesticides they can use, and the new group of U.S. pesticides tend to be very expensive. We have a very tough time fighting new pests, some of which will destroy our farms if they become established.

We believe that successful trade discussions must address these two problems. Thank you for taking the time to hear us.

11 (Applause.)

MR. KELLY: Thank you. Now we have Skip Jonas followed by Jeff Crawford.

MR. JONAS: Good morning. I represent the Florida Tomato Committee, a federal marketing committee that regulates quality standards for fresh Florida tomatoes shipped in interstate commerce. I also represent the Florida Tomato Exchange composed of handlers of fresh market tomatoes produced in central and south Florida, and the Florida Tomato Growers Exchange, whose members are producers.

The value of the Florida fresh tomato crop represents more than 30 percent of the value of all vegetables grown in Florida each year. Florida produces

about 45 to 50 percent of all fresh market tomatoes grown in the U.S. and more than 90 percent of the U.S. production from mid-December to mid-May. Our main competitor is Mexico, who now produces more tomatoes than Florida.

We have been involved in the so-called Florida/Mexico tomato war for about 30 years. We've watched numerous laws passed by the U.S. government that regulate Florida tomato growers but exempt Mexican imports. Even worse are the laws on the books designed to regulate producers of both countries. But Mexican imports are exempted at the whims of bureaucrats who totally ignore the intent of the law.

There are two sets of rules or laws, one for domestic producers and another for imports. A few examples. Section 8(D) of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act says, "Imports must meet the same terms or conditions in grade, size, quality and maturity of product regulated under a federal marketing group." USDA substitutes minimum for same and totally obliterates the intent of the law.

Mexico does not have to grade or size their tomatoes according to U.S. grade standards. USDA exempted them from following the grade standards. Wages. We pay more

per hour than they pay per day. Child labor. They have no rules. Environment protection, no rules. Worker protection, OSHA, no rules. Pesticide regulations, poorly enforced. Inspection at the border. Last February in Nogales 1,200 to 1,500 trucks crossing borders daily. Only 50 totally inspected. Only 25 pesticide residues sampled taken daily.

1|5

In Otay/Mesa, California last month there were 2,500 trucks crossing daily, 15 to 70 with agricultural products. Less than 3 of these got an intensive inspection at any given date.

The last straw and the one that really broke the back of the Florida tomato industry was the passage of NAFTA. The Florida tomato industry was promised by the President of the United States that they would be protected, but unfortunately the promises made were not kept and the industry has suffered hundreds of millions of dollars of losses as a result. Thousands of workers have been displaced.

In tomatoes alone, Florida production has decreased more than 37 percent while imports from Mexico have more than doubled in the first three years of NAFTA according to the latest figures produced by the U.S International Trade Commission. This resulted in a decrease in farm

income to the Florida tomato growers of more than 750 million dollars.

Our trade negotiators adopted several safeguard provisions to assist the Florida tomato industry. The ones tried failed miserably and some were never used.

2|2

Since NAFTA 24 tomato packing houses and more than 100 tomato growers have gone out of business. An antidumping case filed against Mexico resulted in preliminary findings indicating that Mexico had dumped tomatoes into the United States at less than fair value. Dumping oranges ranged from 2.1 percent to over 100 percent with an average of about 20 percent.

Following a recommendation by the Commerce

Department the Florida tomato industry agreed to accept

terms established under a suspension agreement between

Mexico tomato growers and the Commerce Department

establishing a floor price on the imports of Mexican

tomatoes. We recently were informed that neither

Commerce nor customs has the authority needed to enforce

violations of the suspension agreement.

Apparently the Florida tomato industry is not the only one suffering. According to the Department of Commerce figures the U.S. trade deficit has worsened each year of NAFTA. The trade deficit went from 84.5 billion

dollars in '92 to 166 billion dollars in 1996 and has gotten worse each year.

1|5

This has created an enormous trade deficit with Mexico which has not -- which was not present prior to NAFTA. For the three years before the agreement went into effect the U.S. trade balance with Mexico was a surplus of between 1 and 5 billion dollars each year. Since NAFTA has been in effect the balance has degraded from a surplus to deficits in 1995 and '96 of 15.3 and 16.2 billion dollars respectively and continues to increase each year.

Also, the U.S. trade deficit with Canada in 1996 was 22.8 million dollars and it also gets worse each year. Before considering fast-track approval or more NAFTA type trade agreements, let's fix the one that we have now or get rid of it.

Why legislate the end of an important industry like the Florida tomato industry and displace thousands of workers? Maybe if more legislators had to meet payrolls each week it would place a different perspective on the situation.

The Florida Tomato Exchange continues their all-out efforts to try to get the USDA and other governmental agencies to enforce the laws the way they were intended

to be enforced. Too many times the administrative rules designed by the bureaucrats to enforce the laws have no resemblance to the original intent of the law.

The Farm Bill of 1990 had a secure clause known to most marketing Florida managers -- unknown to most marketing Florida managers -- that required marketing order regulations with Section 8(D) provisions to be sent to the USDR for approval. It allowed this office 60 days to rule on the issue. This has prevented many provisions of the Florida tomato marketing orders from being enforced. The USDR nearly always takes 60 days or more, regardless of the urgency for the needed rule.

We aren't asking much. We just want to have the opportunity to market our products in our own country and have imports marketed under the same rules. Thank you very much.

(Applause.)

MR. KELLY: Thank you, Skip. Jeff Crawford followed by Walter (sic) Gamble. Let's hurry as much as we can.

MR. CRAWFORD: Thank you very much. I appreciate this distinguished panel for coming forward to hear from our agricultural groups today. My name is Jeff Crawford. I'm a peanut grower as well as Executive Director of the Florida Peanut Growers Association.

I'm here today to represent the Southern Peanut
Farmers Federation, a coalition made up of Georgia Peanut
Commission, Alabama Peanut Farmers and in Florida the
Peanut Growers Association. We represent the largest
segment of peanut production in the United States, which
is almost 60 percent. Florida grows almost 100,000 acres
of these peanuts.

1|5

I appreciate the opportunity to be here today. Historically, peanut growers have composed world trade negotiations. This happened in the North American Free Trade Agreement and in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. During these previous trade agreements our industry lost all import trade protections and received no export subsidies. We have lost 20 percent of our markets and many of our growers.

This trend will continue unless the Administration takes some interest in the future of the peanut industry. Not one country is now importing U.S. peanuts as a result of the NAFTA or the GATT agreements. Our exports have decreased since the last trade agreement, not increased. We have gone from 403,259 metric tons in 1991-'92 to 244,280 metric tons in '96 and '97. Why? We have the best peanuts planted in the United States. Imports are taking an increasing share of our market.

What can be done to enhance the U.S. peanut history and continue the Administration's pro-trade policies?

First, the U.S. government must consider regulatory systems. U.S. government must comply with -- growers must comply with federal and state environmental, labor and other regulations. The Environmental Protection Agency, the Occupational Safety and Health Administration and Immigration and Naturalization Service all play a role in U.S. grower's business. How many of our trade partners impair their agriculture industry as much as we do in the United States?

1|5

Chemical regulations and labor restriction costs are increasing, not decreasing for peanut growers. This has to be reviewed in any new agreements.

Second, market access must be controlled. An entired industry has been created in Canada just to process peanuts and peanut products. Although many of the products passing through Canada to the U.S. are applied to the GATT quotas, others are not. The confectionery items entering the U.S. outside of any peanut tariff or in quotas would equate to approximately 40,000 tons of farm stock peanuts.

This is about one-half of the total access granted by the GATT for peanuts. All peanut outlets must be

counted against tariff rate quotas and not bailed out to enter outside of them because of misclassification.

1|5

Access for a commodity should only be granted to countries which are directly involved in producing the commodity as determined by the rules bargained.

Argentina and Mexico do grow peanuts. Promoting trade agreements that include peanuts to countries having no interest in producing peanuts should not occur.

The rules of origin under NAFTA for Mexico should apply to other new trade partners. They should be exported to the U.S. as long as they are made of a particular country's own raw product. This would bring equity to a marketplace that has been solely infused by Canada.

Third, sanitary and phytosanitary standards should be strengthened. Some exporting countries have already been to World Trade Organizations and lessened or diminished current sanitary and phytosanitary standards. We do not support this. Peanut growers have worked very hard with the public research institutions to establish the world's safest and largest and highest quality peanut in the market. Standards should be made tougher.

Consumers have to be the Administration's top priority including safety issues. Consumer advocates are right on

this issue.

1|5

Fourth, snapback provisions should be implemented. Although the U.S. peanut program has a price import system we are not dissimilar from other commodities in this regard. We are at a disadvantage with other commodities in that we have lost all import protection, have no export subsidies and have not been supported by the U.S. trade representative and ensured that the imported products are not coming into the U.S. unfairly.

We also have not received the support of the Secretary of Agriculture in encouraging peanut farmers in the international feeding programs as other commodities have received. This stares in the face of a product that is low cost and high in nutrition. Snapback provisions should protect peanut growers at any time imports begin to cause significant interference with the operation of the peanut program.

Fifth, to provide safeguards in the event of changing exchange rates between currencies. This impacts all commodities in light of our new world economy. It has to be considered.

Southeastern peanut growers want to be a part of the trade negotiations. We plan to continue our efforts to be heard by working with the Administration and Congress,

but we are concerned that the Administration has not considered the decline of U.S. agriculture in the last two years. Our industry has had little support because we have not been staunch free trade advocates. This neglect has cost us over 20 percent of our markets and thousands of dollars.

We ask you to consider the impact of these agreements on the peanut industry. We look forward to working with you in the development of trade agreements that we can support. Thank you for allowing me to be heard today.

(Applause.)

1|5

MR. KELLY: Walter (sic) Gamble followed by Larry Bartle.

MR. GAMBLE: I thank you on behalf of the peanut growers of this Nation to have an opportunity to testify here today. My name is Wilbur Gamble and I'm a peanut grower from Taylor County, Georgia. I am Chairman of the National Peanut Growers Group to be representing peanut growers across this nation.

The United States relies on its predominant world market supply of peanuts based on a combination of price and quantity. With past trade agreements ensuring Argentina a share of the U.S. market we have encouraged

an expansion of peanut protection to that country which now supplies not only part of the U.S. market but also much of the world market.

1|5

Asia has historically been one of the largest markets for U.S. exported peanuts but now recent fines and problems have dramatically reduced the amount of peanuts exported to this region. China is the largest producer of peanuts in the world, while only a small quantity of these peanuts can enter the U.S. venue.

Instead they enter through other countries such as Canada.

In countries like Canada these Chinese peanuts are made into peanut butter and enter the U.S. in extended quantities. China has also recently came a major world supply of the market that has been driven by prices rather than quality.

It is our sincere hope that the trade policy staff committee can structure policies which will fairly deal with the problems currently we encounter by setting and developing new peanut policies.

Number one, U.S. peanut growers have not benefited from the past trade agreement. To the best of our knowledge, there is not a single country now importing U.S. peanuts mainly as a result of the trade agreement.

Rather than seeing export increases as a result of trade agreements we have, instead, seen them decline. U.S. peanuts and peanut production have deceased.

Number two, no consideration was given in the past agreements that the U.S. government regulatory system as compared to that of other countries. U.S. must comply with numerous environmental regulations, work protections, minimum wage rates, local and state taxes, and the cost of any other rules are dictated by U.S. standards of living. We must be given an opportunity to compete on a level playing field, which in our case has not been equal to the definition of free trade.

Number three, many excesses must be controlled by strict rules of -- market excess must be controlled by strict rules of origin. Canada has built an entire infrastructure of processing peanuts and peanut products for export to the U.S. market while some of these quantities come from the GATT import quota of peanuts -- paste and peanut butter. Those products are not comprised of this quota.

In the past peanut containing confectionery items have entered the U.S. as confectionery items rather than peanut items. Beginning in January of 1998 all peanut containing confectionery items were set out in the

customs WTS system separately. From January to December of 1998 over 240 million of these type of products entered the U.S. outside of peanut tariff rate quotas. This equates to approximately 40,000 tons of farm stock peanuts or nearly one-half of the excess granted under GATT for peanuts.

1|5

Any new agreement should make sure that peanut items are counted against tariff rate quotas and not be allowed to be outside of these miscalculations. Under NAFTA

Mexico is allowed, duty and tariff-free quota free, to send peanut products into the U.S. as long as they were made from Mexican grown peanuts. The same rules of origin standards should be adopted in future agreements for all of our trading partners.

Number four, the current agreement fails to adequately provide safeguards in the event of changes in the exchange rate between countries. This is an important issue and must be considered in any trade initiative.

Number five, it was clear at the last meeting of the WTO in Geneva for the anniversary celebration that any listing of current sanitary and phytosanitary standards are unacceptable. Contrary to this position to date, those that were dumping peanuts in the world market for

little or low quality standards, we need to strengthen and curb sanitary and phytosanitary standards. Through the USDA we have developed the safest, highest quality in the world. To delete or ignore these efforts is a violation against the consumers in the peanut industry.

1|5

Number six, the elimination of Section 20(T) during the NAFTA negotiations, import protection to peanut growers, are very few. Other commodities have very strict border assistance programs and import protection through an active U.S. trade representative office. The USTR has never shown an interest in protecting the peanut growers from similarly imported products. We ask that the Administration take a look at possible snapback provisions that would protect the peanut growers at any time the import company causes an interference in the operation of the peanut program.

The peanut industry opposes both NAFTA and GATT, clearly the policy of the Administration, moving forward without our support. Our reason for opposing an agreement is we have lost over 20 percent of our share which would be more competitive. Our price quota has been cut 10 percent. We are not better off today than we were prior to NAFTA. We ask that the Administration review the impact of these agreements on the peanut

industry before any new negotiations are completed.

We ask that you take into account our issues of concern and encourage growth through new trade policies in the U.S. peanut industry and not continue the demise. Thank you.

(Applause.)

MR. KELLY: Thank you, Wilbur. Now Larry Bartle, if we could, followed by Mary Lou Racjheal.

MR. BARTLE: Thank you. My name is Larry Bartle.

I'm the current President for the Florida Cattlemen's

Association. As Commissioner Crawford knows, cattlemen

tend to be pretty direct, blunt and to the point, so I'm

going to keep my comments fairly short.

I am a fourth generation Floridian, third generation cattleman. I'm representing our state association here today. We have around 4,500 members in our association. I, myself, come from a family that has deep roots in agriculture, not just cattle -- formerly in citrus, some timber, some sod -- we're kind of a diversified operation.

Florida, in general right now has around 1.1 million head of mamma cows in production. Our state ships out over 600,000 head of calves every year to other states for growing and feeding after they are weaned from their

mothers. Even though Florida doesn't feed cattle to slaughter, we are directly affected by the amount of beef or beef products that are exported.

1|5

We are the first link in a production change. Any time our exported amounts change there is a direct relation to the price that is paid to our producers for their calves.

I understand the importance of foreign trade not only for our beef products but also for live animals, because my family's operation also includes exporting quarter horses and breeding beef cattle.

Currently, 12 percent of the U.S. beef supply is exported. I have been involved for around 15 years at the state level in our industry. I remember when the European ban on U.S. beef first started. Bob Josserand was the president of the National Cattleman's Association at that time. He did an interview on the Today Show about the ban. He stated at that time the ban was truly a trade barrier and not a health issue. Today the statement has not changed one bit.

As you know, scientific studies have shown there is no health risk to consumers for beef produced with growth promotants. We urge you to make the EU follow the deadline given to them and make their markets open up to

our products. We just want equal access to their market.

Let their consumers decide which beef they would rather

eat. They will decide if our products are more

desirable.

Last week I did an interview with a German television station. They knew about the scientific studies on the health risks. They wanted to see cattle that had been treated with growth promotants. When I showed them what an implant actually was and how it was given, they seemed to be completely surprised from what they had been hearing in their countries. I know they left with a better understanding of the real reason behind the ban.

Another topic important to us is the country of origin labelling. Given a choice, the U.S. consumer would prefer U.S. grown products. This also ties into not allowing or limiting importation of products that are not up to USDA inspection standards. We're not allowing products into our country that are subsidized by or price supported by other countries.

I hope this forum will help you -- will assist you in your coming negotiations. Thank you.

2 (Applause.)

1|2

1|5

MR. KELLY: We're going to need to break for lunch.

We've got a number of press here. I apologize for that, but I think it's important. I think all of you in agriculture recognize that we don't always do a good job of speaking to the press, and so we're going to let our panel do that. We'll start back at 1 o'clock and we'll continue with people that are there, as well as some others. So I'd like to thank all of you for doing a good job of trying to stay on schedule. We have a lot of people here and a lot of good comments. I'd also like to thank the panel for listening, which is what they came to do.

(Whereupon a lunch recess was held.)

MR. KELLY: If you get your seats we'll get started. We ran a little over and so we're going to go to the schedule of speakers that we had and then we'll open this up. When the prepared speakers are through we'll probably get a little question and answers -- we're fortunate to have joining our panel Ms. Teresa Howes, a representative of USTR and I think Dr. Martha Roberts needs no introduction, but we are also fortunate to have her to join our panel at this point. We're going to start back.

One thing that I was asked to mention, and I think most of you are aware of this but I hope you are -- we

are recording this session. Any comments will be recorded and will be forwarded on. We'd like for all of you to know that what you say is important. We appreciate you taking the time to be here. We know how busy everybody is, but we do appreciate all the participation of each and every one of you. It is important to us what you say, so please continue to express your feelings in this Listening Session.

1|5

Okay. In order to try to keep us moving along we're going to go back to our schedule and we're going to ask

Ms. Mary Lou Racjheal. We apologize for breaking but we had the press here. We did need to do that. But Mary Lou, please proceed.

MS. RACJHEAL: My name is Mary Lou Racjheal and I am Vice-President of the Florida Phosphate Council, a private non-profit corporation which serves as the trade association for the phosphate mining and the phosphate fertilizer manufacturing industry in Florida. The council has seven member companies, multi-national in character and international in scope. These companies comprise almost 100 percent of the phosphate operations that occur in Florida.

Fair trade and expanding market access are issues of vital importance to phosphate producers in Florida. I am

joined here today by representatives of our member companies including Cargill Fertilizer, CF Industries, IMC Agrico Company, Mulberry Corporation, PCS Phosphate White Springs and U.S. Agrichemicals Corporation.

1|5

The Florida phosphate industry has been in continuous operation for more than 100 years and currently owns or has mineral rights to 524,000 acres in Colombia, DeSoto, Duval, Hamilton, Hardee, Hillsborough, Manatee, Pasco, Polk and St. John's counties. Florida provides about 75 percent of the nation's phosphate supply and about 25 percent of the world's supply. Ninety percent of the phosphate mined is used to make fertilizer.

At the end of 1998 the industry had 8,061 employees who received a total payroll, including fringe benefits, of more than 456 million dollars. This is an average of more than \$56,000 per year per employee. For every job in the industry at least five others exist because of the industry. For example, according to the Tampa Port Authority, the Port of Tampa generates 93,000 jobs and almost half of that number are phosphate related.

In addition, at least 50 percent of the tonnage handled by the Port is phosphate related. In 1998 the industry paid approximately 1.3 billion dollars for

equipment and supplies, 125 million dollars in taxes and fees, 148 million dollars on services such as electricity and telephone, and 215 million dollars on land transportation of phosphate products.

1|5

In 1998 the value of fertilizer exports from Florida was 1.8 billion dollars. If I were to leave you with one point of emphasis, it is that trade with China is key to the Florida phosphate industry. China is a major trading partner with the industry. China's fertilizer market is the largest in the world, including 28 percent of phosphate fertilizers.

The U.S. exports approximately 7 million tons per year of phosphate fertilizer to China, which represents almost half of total U.S. phosphate exports and nearly one-fourth of total U.S. phosphate production. So the Florida Phosphate Council strongly recommends the completion of the China WTO session agreement and supports permanent, normal trade relations for China.

Dr. Roberts, we would appreciate very much if you would convey to Commissioner Crawford how much we appreciate being asked to appear today to address the important issues of fair trade and global market access. Dr. Siddiqui, Mr. Baas and Ms. Howes, we appreciate the time that you are giving in evaluating what is really a

very multi-faceted and complex topic.

1|5

As I said, we have representatives from our member companies in the audience if you have any questions, so we would be happy to respond. Thank you.

MR. KELLY: Thank you very much for that. We'll now continue with representatives of the sugar industry.

We'll start with Robert Underbrink followed by Miller Couse.

MR. UNDERBRINK: Good afternoon. Thank you for the opportunity to be here with you today. I'm Robert Underbrink, Vice-President of King Ranch. We farm about 12,000 acres of sugarcane in Florida. I am also President of Consolidated Citrus Limited Partnership which farms approximately 39,000 acres of citrus.

Both of the companies that I represent are concerned about the upcoming WTO negotiations, however today I will speak to you about the impact of these negotiations on sugar.

In 1987, at the start of the Uruguay Round of the GATT, the sugar industry endorsed the goal of free trade. Today our industry endorses the goal of genuine global free trade in sugar. We want global free trade in sugar because we are efficient growers. We are efficient growers despite some of the world's highest government-

imposed costs per labor and environmental protection. We welcome the opportunity to compete on a genuine level playing field, however until we achieve that free trade goal the United States must keep at least the minimum sugar policy that we have in place today.

1|1

Subsidizing the dumped sugar market should not displace efficient American producers. We are concerned about the WTO negotiations. Results of past trade agreements remain a problem. More than 100 countries produce sugar and have some form of governmental intervention. Unfortunately, these policies were not significantly changed in the Uruguay Round Agreement.

Compliance with these agreement obligations has been and remains a major problem. A wide gap in labor and environmental standards between developed and developing countries has not been satisfactorily addressed. Export subsidies, state trading enterprises and developing countries' obligations have not been disciplined.

To date, the world sugar market remains the most distorted agricultural trade. Lavish export subsidies from the European community allow it to dump excess sugar on the world market. The Brazilian sugar industry was largely built around its subsidized sugar-to-alcohol program. Mexico subsidizes its sugar exports. Australia

regulates its market with massive monopolistic state trading enterprise. These are just a few examples of the distortions of the world market.

1|1

1|5

Based on previous experience with trade agreements, I have the following five recommendations. One, United States should not force any new agreements or reduce its government programs any further until other countries have complied fully with the Uruguay Round.

Two, United States should not reduce its support for agriculture programs until other countries have reduced their supports to our level.

Three, export subsidies and state trading enterprises should be given top priority in the next Trade Round.

Four, the wide gap in agricultural, labor and environmental standards between developed and developing countries should be taken into account.

Number five, the Uruguay Round approach of a rigid, one-size-fits-all formula will not fit the needs of U.S. agriculture in general or for sugar, in particular. Each commodity is different and these differences need to be taken into account. Sugar is very important to Florida, as you know, and we can compete with sugar producers anywhere in the world but we can not compete with other

government's treasuries.

1|5

I urge you to negotiate carefully and give us an opportunity to compete and prosper in a genuine, free trade environment. Thank you.

MR. KELLY: Thank you, Robert. We have Miller Couse followed by Ardis Hammock.

MR. COUSE: Good afternoon. I'm speaking to you today as a community banker in Florida who works closely with the Florida sugar industry. My name is Miller Couse and I'm President of the First Bank of Clewiston. My family also owns and operates a small sugar cane farm.

Sugar farmers have been customers of our bank for over 65 years. They work hard and are not asking for a handout or any special treatment from the government.

All they ask is to be treated fairly and reasonably.

American sugar farmers are efficient by world standards and would love the opportunity to compete with other farmers under genuine free trade conditions, but they can not compete with foreign governments, nor should we have to.

I can tell you firsthand that the farm economy in this country is in its worst shape in decades. In the three years since the 1996 Farm Bill, commodity prices have fallen by 10 percent. Farm bankruptcies are

proliferating and rural economies are in crises. Keep in mind that the U.S. sugar industry provides 420,000

American jobs in 40 states, many of them in small agricultural communities like mine. We need to protect these American jobs.

1|1

Therefore, please do not enter into any agreement that would cause further determent to the American farmer. We must first ensure that all countries comply with past agreements before the United States forges any new agreements. A flexible request offer type of negotiation strategy must be followed in the next trade agreement rather than the rigid, across the board formula. A one-size-fits-all formula approach does not work in banking, and it certainly does not work in agriculture.

In this Round of negotiations we must adopt a negotiation strategy that will address the huge disparities and support among various nations and turn the United States unilateral concessions to our advantage.

As a banker and an amateur economist I have always believed in free trade. Over the past several years, whether it's GATT or NAFTA, I keep seeing the American farmer being hammered when the U.S. participates in free

trade on a one-sided basis. We would ask that you give us fair trade, not free trade. Thank you.

1|5

(Applause.)

MR. KELLY: After Ardis we'll have George Cooper.

MR. HAMMOCK: Thank you for the opportunity in this USDA/USTR Listening Session for Sarah and I to participate. I am Ardis Hammock, a sugarcane grower from Clewiston, Florida and a five-year member of the Agricultural Trade Advisory Committee, ATAC, for sweetener. I am here today with my husband Allen and my daughter Sarah. Our family has been growing sugarcane in south Florida for over 60 years.

Sugar farmers have long endorsed the goal of global free trade because U.S. sugar producers are very efficient by world standards, and we would welcome the opportunity to compete on a genuine level playing field. Until that free trade goal, which must be a fair trade goal, is achieved the U.S. must retain at least the minimum sugar policy now in place to prevent foreign subsidized sugar from unfairly displacing efficient American producers such as my family and fellow growers.

The U.S. farm economy is in its worst shape in decades. In the three years since the '96 Freedom to Farm Bill was adopted commodity prices have fallen, farm

income has fallen, and farmers and their banks are going bankrupt right and left. This has devastated many rural farming communities. Sugar farmers are sharing in that misery.

1|5

It is bad enough that sugar prices to us farmers has been flat or declining for the past 15 years, but the price we receive for our sugar has dropped 10 percent under the Freedom to Farm Bill. Although the U.S. Congress passed emergency relief legislation to farmers the past two years, none of those funds have gone to sugar farmers.

In delivering my message today I am speaking with two voices. The first voice is with the knowledge and foresight of an ATAC member dealing with this serious trade issue. I encourage our government to negotiate very carefully and rationally when considering additional trade agreements. The 1999 WTO Ministerial will pay a pivotal role in establishing the scope, parameters and goals of the next multi-national trade realm.

As an ATAC member I give you the following suggestions as the U.S. government enters into the upcoming WTO trade negotiations. All countries must comply with past agreements before the U.S. forges any new agreements. In addition, the U.S. should be given

credit for complying before requiring to make further cuts in the next Round.

Second, the U.S. must not reduce its support for agricultural programs any further, particularly for import-sensitive crops such as sugar until other countries have reduced their support to the U.S. level.

1|5

Third, the U.S. government should take into account labor and environmental standards. There is a huge gap in labor and environmental standards between developed and developing countries and nearly three-fourths of the world's sugar is produced in developing countries. A flexible request offer type of negotiating strategy must be followed in the next trading realm rather than a rigid, across the board formula approach. This is the only manner in which we can address the huge imbalance and support some of the nations and turn the U.S. unilateral concession to our advantage.

That being said, now my voice is from the heart as a farmer, a farmer's wife, and a mamma. Daniel Webster said it best, "Let us never forget that the cultivation of the earth is the most important labor of man.

Unstable is the future of the country which has lost its taste for agriculture." Today I brought with me the most important issue you need to deal with during

negotiations, my daughter Sarah.

As you can see, she is proudly wearing her FFA jacket. The blue Future Farmers of America jacket is a symbol of all that we as farmers hold dear. It symbolizes the next generation of American farmers. It symbolizes the continuation of our strongly held family values and farming traditions. Most of all, it symbolizes the faith of our youth in tomorrow and that there is a future in farming.

This is what our trade negotiators need to remember -- that what they are doing is not just some intellectual exercise involving the trade policies of various countries. It's not a game and they should not use farmers as pawns in their negotiations. They are dealing with real people's lives. They are dealing with our future, and most importantly the future of our children. Please don't disregard Sarah's future. Don't give away her birthright to some frenchman whose government heavily subsidizes his sugar beet farm and wants to dump his sugar into our marketplace.

Ambassador Barshefsky said during these Listening
Sessions and I quote, "The USTR and the USDA negotiators
will continuously review the recommendations from these
sessions in developing our negotiation objectives for the

next Round of agriculture negotiations." To ensure you do this, Sarah will give you a booklet to take to the negotiating table. I don't think that the USDA has printed this manual. It's entitled, "Life's Little Instruction Book to Save the American Sugar Farmer." In it you will find the four positions sugar farmers urge you to use in negotiations, as well as reminders of the reason you should not sell out American farmers to foreign bankrolled farmers.

We expect the American government to stand up for American sugar farmers like me and for future farmers like Sarah, her brother Robert, and all the other Future Farmers of America. We realize, however, that life isn't a bowl of cherries, it's a bunch of raisins. Raisin' cain, raisin' kids and raisin' cash. We can't raise cash from raising cain to raise kids if you don't protect us from unfair trade practices. We believe you can cultivate trade agreements to reap a large harvest for Future Farmers of America. Just read your instruction booklet. Thank you.

(Applause.)

1|5

MR. KELLY: Thank you. Now we've got George Cooper followed by McKinsly Chatman.

MR. COOPER: My name is George Cooper and I am CEO

of Glade Grove Supply Company and I have abbreviated my statement down to -- it was one page at the beginning but now that we have more time this afternoon I'll be able to read the entire presentation.

1|5

Not really -- having no formal education, being the product of the Dade County School System, I don't know that many words. My family has been pedalling iron to the south Florida agricultural community since 1938.

Somebody asked me the other day, he said, "You've been in farm machinery all of your life?" and I said, "Not yet," but it seems like it's turning out that way.

We operate dealerships in Motley, Belle Glade and Avon Park. My accountant assures me that would qualify me as a three-time loser in any court of law in the state of Florida. We're basically in the sugar industry in Belle Glade, which farms about 500,000 acres of the very finest, most productive soil in the world.

We employ about 15,000 people directly in Belle Glade in the sugar industry. All the 40,000 people that live in the four small towns on the south end of the lake are in the sugar industry. So always put it in personal as to who the lives are. We also have much far-reaching than that. We run Case International's tractor plant in Fargo, North Dakota for two weeks every year just

providing the tractors that go into the Belle Glade area.

1|5

When I came out of southeast Asia in 1963 four percent of the population of the U.S. was involved in agriculture. It's less than half that now. We've lost a population. We've lost the votes. You can pretty well step on agriculture with impunity as far as the votes are concerned but not as far as fairness goes.

By the year 2010 eight percent of the agriculture in the United States will be produced by less than 120,000 different entities. That's what American agriculture has done to provide you with fresher, better, safer and more variety food than any other place in the world at a much cheaper price than anywhere else in the world.

As you negotiate these things, I want you to remember that it is not all in one basket. You said, "Well, we'll give up a little on sugar here and we'll get back on corn there." It doesn't work that way. You give up on sugar, you pulled the sugar guy down, too. He doesn't go out to the midwest and grow corn. So you've got to remember it's not one basket, it's a lot -- it's thousands of little baskets of everybody. So negotiate in kind.

Something that has happened in the last 20 years that I've been in business -- well, in the last 15 years

-- I sold a tractor the other day. Basically it did the same work, but looked a lot different -- the paint job was different, different cab on it, for \$55,000. I sold that essentially same tractor 15 years ago for \$15,000. The price of sugar was the exact same to our farmers now as it was 15 years ago. We have done that for 15 years by mechanizing the sugar industry in Florida. We've done a good job of it and we've done it in the face of enormous environmental concerns.

1|5

If you take out an acre of our land and put it in the glades, to replace it with sugar production anywhere else in the world will take three acres and most likely that will be tropical rain forests in South America and Africa and that only lasts for five or six years and then they have to move off of it. So you'd wipe out three acres of rain forest for every acre of sugar that we lose in the state of Florida.

As we sit here today, one of our sugar mills, 10 percent of our production of sugar in the state of Florida, is being auctioned off. Fifteen hundred jobs are lost directly plus the other 1,000 or so jobs related to that company are being -- are eliminated today. If that was anywhere else there would be a human cry of so-and-so lays off 1,500 workers in West Palm or Dade County

or whoever, but we're going without a whimper and very quietly. So remember that in negotiating. Your negotiators are in a lot of little baskets, not all one. Thank you.

(Applause.)

1|5

MR. KELLY: McKinsly Chatman and then we'll have Jim Handley.

MR. CHATMAN: Good afternoon. My name is McKinsly Chatman and I'm a member of -- I'm a member and student of Local 2152 of the International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers. I am an employee of the Atlanta Corporation which is a grower and processor and refiner of sugarcane grown in Palm Beach County and south Florida.

I work hard every day and my fellow employees and I can compete with foreign workers but we can not compete with foreign governments. So that's why I think it is important for me to come here today to speak to you about the upcoming WTO negotiations.

The United States sugar industry has long endorsed the goal of global free trade because U.S. sugar producers produce an efficient world standard and welcome the opportunity to compete on a level playing field until free trade goals are achieved. However, the United

States must maintain at least the minimum sugar quality to prevent foreign subsidies dumping unfairly to replace efficient American producers.

While unanimously the sugar industry supports the goal of free trade, we have serious concerns of past agreements about structure, future multi-national regional trade agreements, labor and environment standards. They should be part of the negotiations.

A wide gap in labor and environmental standards has developed between developed and developing countries and must be taken into consideration on the next trade Round to add both incentives and penalties to ensure global standards, risks to developed country's levels rather than fall to developing country's levels.

Finally, the United States must not reduce support for agriculture programs, particularly import-sensitive crops such as sugar until other countries have reduced their support to our level.

Again, I thank you for allowing me to express my concerns. Thank you very much.

21 (Applause.)

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

14

1|5

16

17

18

19

20

22

2|3

MR. KELLY: Now we have Jim Handley. I apologize, Jim. We were rushing before and we skipped one. I apologize.

MR. HANDLEY: No problem. I'll be real short and quick. I'm Jim Handley. I'm the Executive VicePresident of the Florida Cattlemen's Association. Right before lunch you heard from our President Larry Bartle.
We're a grass roots organization that is comprised of ranchers in the state of Florida.

1|5

I just want to summarize a few points that most of the speakers have mentioned already today. One point about Florida agriculture -- many, many of our producers are quite diverse in their operations. People that are in the cattle business also have citrus groves. People that have sugarcane also have cattle. People that have fruit and vegetable operations also have cattle. They are real diverse, so things that affect one commodity group certainly affect the other.

There are three main themes that I feel as though have come out here today that we hope that you all leave here with, the first one being out in the real world the producers seem to get frustrated with some of the agreements that are in place that aren't being fully implemented. I think the point is that we don't need any additional agreements until we enforce some of the agreements that we have in place.

The European ban, the hormone ban in Europe is a

major frustration in the cattle world. If they don't respond and comply with the way I understand the ruling to be, then I think we will hope to implement some retaliatory measures to maybe make them reconsider and open their market to us and quit protecting us and shutting us out. It's getting extremely serious, and if we're going to maintain viable, profitable agriculture enterprises across the board to all commodity groups, we've got to have fair trade. We've got to have consistent profitability and not just little windows of profitability. I think it was a good point on one of the slides that was shown about the loss of equity. That is definitely occurring.

1|5

In Florida we're fortunate because we have such a development state. On one hand we're fortunate. In many cases, land values go up and people survive that way. But we can't continue to count on that. Another point is taking care of our domestic market. We mentioned the labelling, country of origin labelling. The overwhelming majority of U.S. consumers, we believe will buy and purchase U.S. grown beef -- it's the safest in the world -- if they have the opportunity to make that buying decision at the retail counter.

Then the other issue concerning our domestic --

taking care of our domestic market is the foreign pest, invasive pest controlling our ports. That's about as much of an opening of trade applying a tariff, but it is paying attention to what is coming in here. The cattle industry is fortunate. We aren't suffering like the citrus people are. They are fighting a big one. We could have a rival on our shores, some of the same — some problems of the same magnitude if we don't tighten the ports.

With that, I really appreciate you all taking the time to come to Florida to recognize the magnitude of agriculture here. It is a huge industry and it is important to the state. We really, really appreciate you all going to bat for us and arguing on ag's behalf. Thank you.

16 (Applause.)

1|5

MR. KELLY: That completes our scheduled speakers. We'll now take individuals who would like to come up. First I'd like to ask if the panel has any comments that they'd like to make before we do that. Dr. Siddiqui.

DR. SIDDIQUI: I think most of the speakers addressed the issues. I share total agreement with USDR and USDA that we should not allow EU to get away with those --

MR. BAAS: And the state.

1|5

Dr. SIDDIQUI: And the state. I'm sorry. I think you are aware that the policies that we are taking to task, the decisions made by WTO to the council where their ban was found to be not based on science, we have taken a step, but of course under the WTO dispute resolution process we have May 13th as the deadline if they did not comply. We must continue to authorize to suspend trade positions to EU be acknowledged. This also requires that we give them 30 days to petition and ask for our decision based on the above.

Secondly, we essentially believe in the U.S. position that we will exercise the rights under the review to go against those suspended concessions.

Finally, I want to share with the audience, especially cattlemen and ranchers here, that the U.S. continues to take EU to task because we find U.S. beef grown with hormones is safe. There has been repeated conclusions by international committees and they did not find any health concerns with the use of those hormones, while EU continues to raise concerns — that is just not recently. It was before when essentially there is no new information gathered but it made enough headlines in Europe and essentially what they're saying is there is

some risk of cancer with the use of hormones. We have begun the process of countering and dividing that study. It is not a new study. It is essentially a rehashing of the same old arguments that are present in Europe.

1|5

MR. KELLY: I think what we might do is if there are any questions that the panel has of the audience we will do that, and then we will take individuals. We'll try to keep -- did you have a question?

MR. BAAS: I've got two questions I'd like to ask, if I might. The first one is to somebody, I guess, in the sugar business. My question is, as I understand the price situation, the world price of sugar is something in the 2 to 4 cent range whereas the U.S. price is somewhere around 18 to 22 cents, something like that. So I was very interested to hear the sugar industry folks say, "We're ready to compete with the foreigners as long as the playing field is level," and all that. We certainly share that desire that the playing field should be level.

I'm having a little trouble understanding how one can compete with that huge price difference. Surely -- maybe I'm wrong. Surely subsidies can't explain the price difference of that magnitude -- if I've got the prices correct.

MR. YANCEY: I'll try to answer the question for

you.

1|5

MR. BAAS: Thank you.

MR. YANCEY: My name is Dalton Yancey and I represent the sugar farmers in south Florida, Hawaii and Texas. I'm a native of Florida. The current price of 4 1/2 cents for sugar, as you accurately reported, is the world price as you read in the Wall Street Journal every morning. That is a price that is a dumping price and represents all these other subsidies around the world that are creating excess production right now, and it also represents the Brazilian devaluation of the real a few months ago which knocked the price down about 2 cents right off the bat.

But if all the other sugar producing segments from around the world were to eliminate what they do in their industries, they would not be able to overproduce and the price of sugar would reach an equilibrium which is higher than the support price in the United States and we would do very well with that. So that's why we are for free trade, but we're for it if everybody does it. We're not going to jump off the bridge first. We all have to hold hands and jump off into the cold water of free trade together and we will do just fine because we are efficient, we've got good land, we've got good production

practices, we have good varieties, and we've got the best market in the world right here in our backyard.

1|5

But in order to do that, we ask the trade negotiators to get rid of these other country's subsidy programs and bring them down where we are so that we can then compete -- and that's what it's all about in trade. It's competition. We can compete if the ground is level.

MR. BAAS: Thank you. If I could just ask a question of a citrus person. I understand that some of the Brazilian juice that comes in from Brazil or that the Brazilian juice generally does not taste as good as Florida juice -- I'm not surprised about that, Florida juice is excellent -- but that as a result, Florida juice is mixed with Brazilian juice so that Americans will, in fact, drink it. Is that true and if so, what sort of quantities are we talking about and what does that mean for the -- we've got some pretty dire information about the citrus industry here this morning, and I'm just curious what this means, if it's true, for the citrus industry. Not that I'm proposing that Brazil has free run of our citrus market, at all.

MR. GRIFFITH: I'm Jim Griffith. I've been here since 1946. I don't believe it's fair to say that Brazilian juice that comes in here is not good juice or

not as good as a lot of what we produce. They do produce good orange juice and our standards are such that they by-and-large bring in juice. Actually, there are times that the Brazilian juice has been used to improve the color of some of our low color, early produced oranges. Well, I guess that answers your question.

MR. BAAS: It does answer it. Thank you.

1|2

1|5

MR. KELLY: Thank you, Mr. Griffith. Any other questions from the panel, comments? Dr. Siddiqui.

DR. SIDDIQUI: While we're waiting for somebody to raise a question, maybe you could answer another concern. Several speakers mentioned about the number of pests found in Florida. The U.S. Board of Agriculture inspection services is also concerned about a repeated medfly and citrus canker infestation. I want to assure you USDA is an equal role partner in those negotiation efforts because we believe that these pests if they are established anywhere in the U.S., in Florida or elsewhere, makes our job -- the USDR and the State Department's job difficult to convince trading partners toward -- for any excuse to deny us access to their markets. So I know we share your concerns.

But I think after reducing these infestations to something, I think the jury is still out. We've had

infestations of medfly in California and even in Florida, so I think that these infestations are coming because there is more trade. There is also more travellers.

Both Americans and foreigners are coming to our shores and I think there is a lot of evidence that some of these infestations are getting in because of the travel in the world -- travel is a lot faster than it used to be.

Senator Bob Graham and the folks at USDA set a 40 member panel, a team of scientists, regulatory officials, some of the folks from Florida agriculture -- Richard Gaskella was one of the members of the subcommittee.

They said regarding Florida is already supposed to come along -- this is going to evaluate the effectiveness of USDA's agricultural reporting program and make the conditions what can be done to strengthen and safeguard U.S. agriculture. So I want to assure you that both USDA and the Florida Department of Agriculture is working very closely in terms of reviewing this problem and hopefully finding some solutions.

MR. KELLY: Mr. Baas.

1|1

1|5

2|2

2|3

MR. BAAS: Thank you. One more question I just came up with here. I think Congresswoman Thurman and a number of other people mentioned the necessity or the importance of having a specialty sort of safeguard procedure for

perishable products, and I can understand intellectually why that would be desirable and an interesting thing to have.

1|1

1|5

What I don't understand, having not thought about it very long, is how that might work. I would appreciate if either now or later if somebody who has thought about this a little bit could provide us with some ideas about how this might work in writing or if, in fact, someone has ideas already now, so that we can get the benefit from your thoughts. Thank you.

MR. STUART: Well, I think it's a great question and if we could just go back a little bit in history, particularly during the negotiations in NAFTA and also during the negotiations in the Uruguay Round there was a lot of discussion about coming up with some type of a special safeguard that would specifically address some of the unique characteristics of fruit and vegetable production or perishable seafood production of agricultural products.

What was arrived at within the NAFTA was basically a cookie-cutter approach, basically the tariff or quota approach, which basically dealt with volume. It didn't account for the rapid fluctuations in perishability of the industry. So what we have abdicated historically

going all the way back into the U.S./Canada Free Trade
Agreement, is some type of a mechanism that is sensitive
to price. Offer some type of an issue, whether it's a
five-year floating average of prices or some type of an
immediate trigger that doesn't require any kind of an
injury determination.

1|5

That's what we suggested in the past. Again, during the NAFTA debate they wanted to use the TRQ or Tariff Rate Quota approach and apply it across all commodities, and that simply has not worked for an industry that relies and has such a quick change in market conditions almost on an hourly basis.

MR. BAAS: Just if I could pursue that point for a second. So one thought you have is you might take, for example, a five year moving average of the price of tomatoes and then if the price goes 10 percent lower or 20 percent lower than that price that would give an automatic trigger for a brief safeguard?

MR. STUART: Conceptually, that was the kind of mechanism that was utilized in the U.S./Canada Free Trade Agreement. The problem we have, quite frankly, from a trade and information standpoint is our trade statistics can not keep up with the speed at which the marketplace moves. That's the problem historically we've had with

that.

The other example I'll throw out to you is conceptually what we've used in the tomato dispute, which is basically a floor price. That is not the end-all or necessarily the cure of the situation, but it is to help substantially in stabilizing the market at very low levels.

MR. BAAS: Thank you.

MR. KELLY: Okay. Do we have any others? Mr. Griffith.

MR. GRIFFITH: If I might, I need to distribute something.

MR. KELLY: While he's distributing that, anybody who is interested in speaking, if you will move close and then we'll be ready to go. We'll try to limit this as much as possible so that everybody gets a chance to say something, so please limit it to three or four minutes, if possible.

MR. GRIFFITH: As I said before, I'm Jim Griffith. I've been growing citrus here in Polk County since the early 1950s. I want to just touch on two or three things, that I don't believe have been touched on from the citrus standpoint so far.

I will start out by repeating what others have said.

We really can't tolerate any reductions in the tariff under the situation as it exists today. Sometimes history helps us a little bit, so let me think with you a little bit about something. The tariff we now like was established back in 1930 and has been perpetuated ever since. At that time nobody had dreamed about frozen concentrated orange juice. We didn't even really know about hot pack orange juice, but hot pack concentrate developed by the late '30s and frozen concentrate came in by the late '40s.

1|1

We built this industry on the fact that we had protection from foreign competition under the tariff and we had public that wanted good citrus products. We could produce them. They got them. We supplied the U.S. market. What was created for us by something we didn't ask for -- don't take it away from us when we ask you not to.

We don't really produce enough oranges today to more than supply the U.S. market. In the case of grapefruit, we're the premier producer in the world and we have, over the last 30 years, expanded sales in foreign markets. Unfortunately, we have expanded those sales to the detriment of our domestic sales. So we are selling no more fresh grapefruit today than we used to. Half of it

is going to Japan and Europe and half of it is still staying here. We are selling more processed products.

But we don't really have the competition with grapefruits. Oranges is where our primary concern comes down. We can grow citrus as well as anyone and as cheaply as anyone. We can pack it and process it as cheaply as anyone. But we can't pick and haul it when we compete against cheap labor in other countries and when we compete with other countries who have unregulated industries. They don't have EPAs and they don't have OSHAs and that costs all of us -- I'm glad to see you smiling, Issi. It certainly is true.

We don't have the product to sell to the rest of the world so we don't really have a marketing position to say, "We'll give you something if you'll give us something." Our current forecast doesn't suggest we're going to. Let me talk about for just a moment what's been the result, I think, of the liberalized policies in both republican and democratic administrations over the last 30 years.

Where have we gotten to? Manufacturing capacity in this country is down dramatically. When you take out the wage rates of executive employees, wage rates corrected for inflation have actually gone down. Today all of

American agriculture is in trouble. You haven't done us any favors by what's been done on liberalized trade. It makes no difference whether it's the Iowa corn farmer today or my friends in the tomato industry or those of us in the citrus business, it hasn't been a howling success.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

The last thing I want to touch on from that standpoint is the trade deficit. You see an effect finally here -- in 1998 the highest deficits on record. The only way we sustained those is that foreign dollars have to come in -- they come in here to buy our government bonds. They come in and buy our stocks. They come in and buy our real estate. This industry -they're coming in and competing with this industry here. We're seeing foreign money come in, whether it be from Japan or whether it be from Brazil or whether it be from France, and purchase processing facilities to where they are controlling a substantial chunk of the total industry. I don't believe that's what trade policy was designed to do. I think you need to think about that when we're going forward.

I don't believe these facts can be escaped. I think the facts you've heard today from a lot of special interest groups -- and we are special interest groups because we're none of us very big, but we have a little

niche that we've fitted into over the years. So whether we're growing strawberries in Plant City or citrus here on the ridge or apples in Washington State or some naval oranges in the San Joaquin Valley, we've got special interests and I'm afraid you have to deal with us individually and on that basis. You can't lump us all together. We're not like a foreign farmer. We're not like a cotton grower. We're not that big and we have to be treated specially, so we have to ask for that special treatment.

Don't cut our tariffs any more unless you can offer us something in return. Thank you very much.

13 (Applause.)

1|5

MR. KELLY: Thank you, Mr. Griffith.

MR. SNAGGLE: Members of the Panel, my name is Gary Snaggle. I'm Vice-Chairman of the Florida Farmers and Suppliers Coalition. I'm with Mecka Farms in South Florida. We're a family farming operation. We've been in business over 100 years. We grow winter vegetables and citrus.

I want to be brief, but I speak here with frustration. I've seen broken promises when NAFTA was instituted. I've seen Mexico gain a 65 percent market share of the winter vegetable business in Florida when

they had 35 percent before NAFTA. I've seen 200 Florida farm families go out of business since NAFTA. I've seen misrepresentation, either direct or indirect. United States government assures us that we eat the safest produce in the world, and we do if it's grown in America.

1|5

2|2

The stuff that comes in from Mexico is grown with bad chemicals, child labor, filthy unsanitary conditions and is mixed into the same bin in Washington, D.C. or New York City. You don't have a choice. I note that the biggest supplier of illegal drugs to America, Mexico, an historically corrupt country, now is supplying the majority of produce in America. With a devaluation of the peso, Mexico is quick to dump produce below cost, further depressing the prices American farmers receive.

I'm not happy with a trade policy that allows a 19 billion dollar a month deficit in February and March of this year. I fail to see how that benefits this country. We're the richest country in the world. We didn't get that way through a one world economy that sucks 19 billions a month out of the United States.

Our current trade policy benefits multi-national companies and foreign countries, while it devastates the American working man and farmer. There should be no extension of our free trade policy until the current

inequities are fixed and becomes free and fair trade like these other farmers said. We'll compete with farmers anywhere in the world but it's got to be a level playing field. Thank you.

(Applause.)

MR. KING: My name is Ben King. I'm a seventh generation Floridian and I'm a farm manager for Taylor and Fulton, Incorporated. We are tomato growers and shippers with farming operations in Palmetto and Quincy, Florida and the eastern shore of Virginia. I appreciate the opportunity to speak today.

I would like to encourage our trade representatives to fight for fair and equitable trade in the next Round of negotiations. Future trade agreements should work to help U.S. growers compete against foreign farms which don't adhere to our standards. I think we need to ask a couple of questions about how our trade agreements can impact the social conditions or our less-developed trading partners, such as are good agricultural practices being observed like ours? Are labor conditions in these countries consistent with our standards? Is the environment being protected in these other countries? Are the pesticides they use recognized by the U.S. as of the U.S. authorities to be safe?

You and I both know the answer to these questions is often no. Developing nations do not have the commitment or resources to produce fresh fruits and vegetables according to our standards, standards that U.S. consumers come to expect. Regrettably, those same consumers assume that imported fruits and vegetables are grown under conditions that are comparable to ours. Little do they know.

1|5

To underscore the disparity between U.S. farms and those in Mexico my boss, J. Taylor, President of our company, hired a camera crew -- with a bunch of our money that I made for him on my little farm -- to document the conditions under which tomatoes are grown in Mexico. We looked at growing conditions, labor management, pesticide use and sanitation.

The crew had to travel in secret going to farms without official permission from the government or the Mexican tomato industry. The video that the crew produced revealed shocking disregard for worker safety and environmental protection in Mexico. Young children were shown working side-by-side with adults to pick tomatoes. In one scene, girls were shown covering their faces while a worker sprayed pesticides on top of them.

The video showed the highly toxic farm chemicals,

some no longer legal or registered in the United States, are still used in Mexico. The video also showed farm worker sanitation and howling conditions that American people would find deplorable. One part of the video showed where the people get their drinking water is also where they have their sewage and also where they clean the tomatoes that they pick.

1|5

The video entitled, "The True Cost of Winter Vegetables," convinced a CBS television crew to go to Mexico and document and broadcast it themselves. I would be happy to give you a copy of the CBS program as well as the video that we shot, or probably Lane Stuart from the FFDA has more copies than I do.

Are conditions in Mexico indicative of farm conditions in other developing nations? I can not say for sure, but I think it's probable. We can all remember that the FDA had to restrict importation of raspberries from Guatemala until farming conditions there could be improved to prevent further contamination by a parasite called cyclosporin. In that case, it took hundreds of U.S. consumers to get sick before anything was done.

Because protecting the environment, worker safety and wholesome produce are important to U.S. consumers, I believe they need to be -- all consumers in the United

States need to be aware of where their food is grown.

The simplest way to do this is through country of origin labelling.

Many of our trading partners, notably Japan, United Kingdom and most European nations, require country of origin labelling for importing fresh produce. Here in the U.S. only Florida has a comprehensive labelling law that ensures imported fresh produce is identified at the retail level. Why should we continue to allow other countries to require labelling on our crops when we don't require the same of theirs?

I respectfully urge our nation's trade representatives to seek harmonization of labelling requirements with all of our agricultural trading partners. Country of origin labelling can go a long way towards educating U.S. consumers about where their food is grown and will help them make informed choices about their food.

Our industry has much at stake in the next Round of negotiations. Please work to establish a fair trading environment for our farmers. Thank you.

22 (Applause.)

1|1

MR. KELLY: Thank you. We're scheduled to have a break at 2 o'clock and we're willing to come back, but I

want to ask is there a lot of people that want to speak after this or can we just get one or two and finish now? Okay. I'm seeing several. Dr. Siddiqui does have to catch a plane, so we're going to break now for about 15 minutes and we'll start back at 2:15 sharp and conclude soon thereafter.

(Whereupon a short recess was held.)

1|5

MR. KELLY: Those of you who have got something you'd like to say, please move forward and we'll get started. We're fortunate to have Pat Sheikh take the place of Dr. Siddiqui. Pat is the Director of International Trade Policy for Foreign Ag. Service. We appreciate her being with us today. We'll continue now with comments in this Listening Session with whoever would like to approach the mike.

MR. JOYNER: Thank you. My name is Richard Joyner and I'm President of Farm Credit of Central Florida. I want to thank you for the opportunity to speak today and for your interest in Florida agriculture and how the future trade agreements may affect it.

Farm Credit alone has over 7,500 loans totally in excess of 1.3 billion dollars invested in Florida agriculture. This is representative of the capital investments of our producers. As a cooperative, our

member/borrowers represent all segments of Florida's second largest economic force. You've already heard many of the statistics. Maintaining a healthy, viable agriculture in Florida is extremely important to the citizens of Florida and the United States.

1|1

Through our diverse agriculture we play a major role in helping Americans enjoy the safest and healthiest food supply in the world, while spending less of their available income for food than anywhere else. That means there are more dollars available for other things, thereby allowing our citizens to enjoy the high standard of living we do.

That can only continue if our farmers and ranchers are profitable. Appropriate trade negotiations are paramount to the future success of Florida agriculture. Expanding access to international markets is critical to the economic growth of agriculture. As the next Round of negotiations begin we hope the following issues will be taken into account.

Ensure that science is the only basis for resolving sanitary and phytosanitary issues. Maintain strict adherence to plant and animal pest and disease standards. Provide a clear and prompt resolution to trade disputes. Seek to improve market access provisions and safeguard

measures of existing agreements. Protect measures that help equalize operational costs of U.S. producers and those of other countries that are not subject to the same stringent regulatory standards.

We support the comments you've heard today from Florida Citrus Mutual, Florida cattlemen, the Florida fruit and vegetable people, and the individual growers and producers. A strong viable agriculture is viable to our state and economy. Becoming dependent on foreign markets for food is not an alternative. I would like to thank you for the opportunity to speak today and for the session that has been made available for us. Thank you.

(Applause.)

1|2

MR. KELLY: Thank you, sir. Now who is next? Do we have somebody else? Yes, sir.

MR. WATSON: I'm going to be very brief. I do appreciate the opportunity to be here with this distinguished panel and the distinguished host. I'm Anthony Watson, Jr., Executive Broker of National Juice Products Association headquartered in Tampa, Florida. From the name National you might think it's just a U.S. organization but we have members all over the U.S. and Canada, Brazil, Mexico, Chili, Argentina and I can go on.

NJPA is a trade association whose membership

consists of major -- and I mean most of the major U.S. packers and distributors of fruit and vegetable juices and juice beverages. In the interest of brevity I'm going to say it short and sweet. NJPA opposes the reduction of tariffs on orange, grapefruit, pineapple, lemon and grape juices during the next Round of trade negotiations.

Again, in the interest of brevity, because orange has been covered here today, and I would focus primarily on oranges because of the venue here, we will submit more detailed written comments prior to the July 27th deadline. Thank you for the opportunity.

MR. KELLY: Thank you. We have a question.

MR. WATSON: Yes, you may.

1|1

1|2

1|5

MS. HOWES: I was going to ask if you -- you oppose the reduction of our tariffs but a reduction in tariffs in other countries on these commodities?

MR. WATSON: Oh, we would be in favor of reduction in other countries, but I think if you leave things the way they are the equilibrium that now exists for U.S. processors will be maintained. In other words, our members rely on imported concentrate for any number of reasons. I mean you could look at a freeze in Florida. That was one reason we didn't oppose or we were opposed

to the dumping order that was sought several years ago by Florida Citrus Mutual. We were on opposite sides of it.

We actually felt it benefitted our processor members to have the solids available to maintain the market during a time of short supply in Florida. So I agree with you. All of these issues are very complex, but we believe that at the present time there is an equilibrium that exists that permits us to get quality fresh fruit supplies for processing from domestic sources, while at the same time being able to import concentrate from foreign countries when that is necessary.

MR. KELLY: Yes, sir.

1|5

2|2

MR. BAAS: I probably shouldn't ask this question because I don't want to get you killed, but I don't understand if you're a juice products processing organization or company why you wouldn't want the tariff on citrus to simply -- U.S. tariffs on citrus to go away since that will give you presumably a cheaper product from overseas. I understand -- I'm just asking a very narrow question. I understand there are reasons --

MR. WATSON: Well, I think it assumes that elimination of the tariffs would result in reduced price from the foreign suppliers and I don't think one can make that assumption. I'm not sure it's borne out by history.

MR. BAAS: Okay. So you would argue, I guess, that having -- beyond other reasons for having American citrus producers, it's good for the market to have American citrus competitive --

MR. WATSON: Absolutely. In the case of orange, Florida is the second largest producer in the world.

MR. BAAS: Okay. Thanks.

MR. WATSON: Thank you.

1|5

MR. KIRBY: Good afternoon. Madam Ambassador, Dr. Roberts and members of the panel, my name is Tom Kirby. I'm the Executive and Government Affairs Director of the Dade County Farm Bureau. Many of you may not recognize the name Dade County but we're in the greater Miami metropolitan area.

Once of the problems that we face in production that hopefully you can take into account is that we have a unique situation in Florida with having some of the highest priced farm land in the country. Consequently, that adds -- when you get into the area of competition, that adds yet another burden that we in Dade County have to deal with.

I've watched my membership dwindle. I was born and raised in the Homestead, Florida area and indeed south

Dade where all the farming takes place. I have seen

families that have been in farming for 100 years go out of business due to NAFTA. What George Cooper from Belle Glade, the equipment dealer that spoke to you earlier, failed to mention is that he used to have a dealership in Homestead also but he had to close that operation up.

1|5

Dade County agriculture is a big business. Prior to NAFTA it equated to about a billion dollars in economic impact annually to the Dade County area. Today, following NAFTA, those numbers -- recent numbers came out of the University of Florida put that figure at 732 million.

We produce three major crops in Dade County. The biggest used to be the winter vegetable crops -- tomatoes, pole beans, eggplant, zucchini, cucumber -- all the traditional winter vegetables. We also produce tropical fruits -- mangos, limes, avocadoes, carabola, and some of the more exotic tropicals. The mango industry in Dade County has literally gone down the tubes for the simple reason that we're again in a non-competitive situation. Mexican mangoes are flooding the market.

Our biggest industry today is ornamental horticulture and the people in that industry are just waiting until the day comes when they are going to be

affected. So far they feel rather fortunate that they're not affected at the moment, but they know that sooner or later it's coming with the liberalization of trade policies.

We were promised by the present Administration prior to NAFTA that Florida growers, vegetable growers, would be protected and they haven't been. We want those promises lived up to. We want those promises taken into account and fulfilled prior to any more trade negotiations with anybody anywhere at any time.

We need remedies in place that are effective and that are realistic. If it hadn't been without the help of Commissioner Bob Crawford and our Florida Legislature, the recent tomato wars would have never been resolved. It was just too expensive a process for the average grower.

So we beg you, please fix the inequities in NAFTA before proceeding with any other trade negotiations. We understand -- we don't have our heads in the sand in Dade County. We understand the importance of trade. We're home of one of the busiest airports in the world, Miami International, and one of the biggest seaports in the world, the Port of Miami. International trade has taken over. It's the number one industry. It exceeds tourism

in Dade County. So we know that the trading has got to take place, but as has been repeated time and time and time again here today, it's got to be fair trade, not necessarily free trade.

Let me draw an analogy, and I'm not sure you'll connect with it but it makes sense to me. Back before the NAFTA agreement, Florida tomato growers had an economic impact and cash receipts in this state of about 750 to 800 million dollars annually. That figure, according to Department of Agriculture statistics, has dropped to 487 million. It used to be -- tomatoes used to be the number two crop in this state, second only to citrus.

As was published in a recent Florida Trend article, and I don't think anybody in this room would be proud to admit this or it's not something that they're going to boast about, but tomatoes are now the number three crop in Florida. The number two crop that used to be tomatoes is now illegally produced marijuana. Something is askew with our trade policies and the Administration needs to focus on taking care of Florida's winter vegetable producers. Thank you very much for your time and allowing me to make these comments to you.

24 (Applause.)

1|2

1|5

MR. KELLY: Okay. Thank you. We've got one more. Is there anybody else? We're planning on one more and then we're going to turn this over to Dr. Roberts to conclude it.

1|1

1|2

MR. STEVENS: Good afternoon. My name is Martin Stevens, Golden Gem Growers. I want to add my thanks to those of others for you folks coming down and allowing us to talk to you. I am one of the small third generation citrus growers, however I'm here primarily to speak for a much larger group of growers. I am a member and also an employee for over 40 years and Senior Vice-President of Golden Gem Growers.

Golden Gem is a true cooperative. It was formed in 1947 by three growers who didn't feel like they could get a fair deal anywhere else. It now has over 450 members who own almost 40,000 acres of citrus. Citrus is grown in 28 counties in Florida and we have members in each one of those.

I'm going to abbreviate most of my remarks because most of them have been covered by other people, especially Andy LaVigne. But these growers collectively have invested millions of dollars in facilities in order to try to improve the return on their investment in the groves. The cooperative can do it all including fresh

fruit packing, FCOJ not from concentrate both in bulk and packaged form.

In addition to the 450 growers there are over 800 employees and that doesn't count over 1,000 more who work the groves and pick the fruit on a seasonal basis. None of these people would benefit and all would suffer if anything would happen to the equalizing import tariff that we have on FCOJ.

On a level playing field, the Florida citrus industry can compete with anyone in the world but we don't have a level playing field because of all the things that have been brought out previously. It probably never will be a level playing field because by the time the Brazilians start to pay people as much as we're paying here, we'll probably be paying two or three times as much. After all, in my career I've seen the minimum wage go up over seven times what it was when I started here.

But one of the things that -- I'll leave out most of the rest of this but I wanted to emphasize one thing.

The much touted benefit of free trade would be that you would have lower consumer prices. Believe me, in this situation it ain't gonna happen. I can well remember the good old days when I sold fresh fruit and the price that

the consumer paid had a large bearing on the prices that we charged for fruit. If we lowered our prices, the retailers lowered their prices and we moved more fruit and that was how we got ourselves out of trouble. It's supposed to work that way.

1|5

You probably have economists on your staff that will tell you it would work that way if things like that did -- if we got rid of part of the tariff. But I can tell you it simply won't. There's something different in the real world today in this fresh -- not just citrus, but also processed citrus and vegetables. That is the fact that the retailers have learned that they can hold their prices up high, buy lower and simply make more profit. They do not lower their price every time we lower our price. How that happens, I don't know the reason for it, but I'm sure we would appreciate it if you would check that out. It's real.

I'm sure Commissioner Crawford's office can provide you with all kinds of documentation on that on the kind of markups that these people have been getting. I would like to say to those that are left in the audience, I think we all should take heart. I appreciate the attitude that's been displayed by you folks and the others and the opening remarks. It's a far different

tone and a different attitude than a meeting similar to this that I went to -- I don't remember how many years ago it was, but it was in Vero Beach.

The gentleman who came down from Washington spent a little time riding around Vero Beach and about every second or third car he saw was a Mercedes. He made the assumption that all those Mercedes were being driven by citrus growers and he got up in front of a group just like this and said that if we lowered the tariff on orange juice by 5 or 10 cents a pound solid, it appeared to him that the only difference that would make was that the average citrus grower would just move from this model of Mercedes down to this model of Mercedes.

So I appreciate very much that that is not your attitude. Citrus growers as a group are not a bunch of fat cats. We're just a bunch of hardworking, down-to-earth people that are paddling as hard as we can to keep our nose above water. Thank you very much.

19 (Applause.)

1|5

MR. KELLY: Thank you. I'd like to say thank you to each one of the speakers for their very concise and thoughtful remarks. I think the panel would want me to echo that and tell you that they appreciate your help in keeping this on time. You've done a good job of that.

I'd also like to thank the panel for being very attentive for these comments. With that, I'm going to turn it over to Dr. Martha Roberts for any conclusionary remarks.

1|5

DR. ROBERTS: Well, there's some of us here that are going to stay to the end 'til we get what we need, right? On behalf of Commissioner Bob Crawford I would like to express his deep appreciation and the deep appreciation of all the Florida agriculture, both to the Office of the U.S. Treasury and to the U.S. Department of Agriculture and to the U.S. State Department for their participation in this Listening Session.

Again, Commissioner Crawford said it was a real honor for Florida to be the first in these Listening Sessions. Commissioner Crawford wanted me to make certain to express our sincere appreciation to Matt Dempsey, his Federal State Director, as well as Will Bussey and other members of his staff for their organization of this and to everybody in Florida agriculture for your participation, your interest and your presence and your comments. Without our comments to USTR and USDA and the State Department, they can not know what we need in the negotiations. We have an opportunity. If we do not take it, we're to blame if they don't know what's important.

So I encourage those of you who have not made oral presentations, if there are points that you know that were not made, to please put them down in writing and submit them to the agencies. They would very much appreciate that.

Commissioner Crawford, in his opening remarks said,
"No issue is more important to Florida agriculture than
international trade and international trade agreements."
He says, "We've got to maximize the winners. We've got
to minimize the losers." You had your opportunity today
and hereforward to make sure your voice and your needs
for Florida agriculture are known.

Thank you for being here and my thanks again to USTR, USDA and the State Department for having this, the first Listening Session, for the upcoming negotiations. Thank you.

(Whereupon the Listening Session was concluded at 2:25 p.m.)

	160
1	STATE OF FLORIDA)
2	COUNTY OF POLK)
3	I, GAYE MONAGHAN, Certified Verbatim Reporter, certify
	that I was authorized to and did report verbatim the foregoing
5	Listening Session; and that the transcript is a true record of
6	the testimony given by the participants.
7	I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am not a relative, employee,
8	attorney, or counsel of any of the parties, nor am I a
9	relative or employee of any of the parties' attorney or
10	counsel connected with the action, nor am I financially
11	interested in the action.
12	DATED this, 1999.
13	
14	
15	
16 17)
1 8	
1	
20	
21	
2	
2	
18 19 20 21 22 23 24 29	
2	